R E P O R T   R E S U M E S

ED 003 087   40

THE EFFECT OF INSTITUTIONAL LIVING ON THE VALUES OF MENTALLY
HANDICAPPED, DELINQUENT, ADOLESCENT BOYS.
BY- LEMA, DAVID E.
SYRACUSE UNIV., N.Y., RESEARCH INSTITUTE
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0117   PUB DATE   65
CONTRACT OEC-5-10-400
EDRS PRICE MF-$.45 HC-$11.52   288P.

DESCRIPTORS- *VALUES, *EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED, *DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR, *ADOLESCENTS, CORRECTIVE INSTITUTIONS, *INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT, NEGRO YOUTH, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, SOCIAL VALUES, MALES, SYRACUSE, NEW YORK

THE SOCIAL INTERACTION IN AN INSTITUTION WAS STUDIED TO DETERMINE ITS INFLUENCE ON VALUE-BELIEF PREFERENCES OF MEMBERS OF A SPECIFIC GROUP. A SAMPLE OF ABOUT 58 MENTALLY HANDICAPPED, DELINQUENT BOYS RANGING IN AGE FROM 12 TO 16 YEARS WAS SELECTED. THE SELECTION WAS BASED ON TIME-IN-RESIDENCE, INTELLIGENCE SCORES, ETIOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION, AND SOCIOECONOMIC LEVEL. GROUPINGS WERE MADE FOR ANALYSIS AS A TOTAL SAMPLE, BY INSTITUTION, RACE, AGE, AND TIME-IN-RESIDENCE. THE INSTRUMENTS USED TO MEASURE VALUE-BELIEFS WERE THE PERSONAL AND IMPERSONAL VALUES, ETHICAL, MORAL, AND SOCIAL (VEMS). RESULTS DERIVED FROM ANALYSES AND COMPARISONS SHOWED THAT NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND IN THE VALUE-BELIEFS OF THE SUBJECTS RELATED TO TIME-IN-RESIDENCE. THE EVIDENCE ALSO SUGGESTED THAT LITTLE EMPHASIS IS PLACED ON TEACHING VALUES IN THE INSTITUTIONS. THE INVESTIGATOR SUGGESTED THAT RESEARCH IS NEEDED TO GENERALIZE ON SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT. (RS)

HC+Y

BR-5-8117

ED003087

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

THE EFFECT OF INSTITUTIONAL LIVING ON THE VALUES OF MENTALLY HANDICAPPED, DELINQUENT, ADOLESCENT BOYS

by

David E. Lema, Ed.D.
Syracuse University

June 1, 1965--October 31, 1965

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Office of Research in Special
Education and Rehabilitation

THE EFFECT OF INSTITUTIONAL LIVING ON THE VALUES OF MENTALLY HANDICAPPED, DELINQUENT, ADOLESCENT BOYS

by

David E. Lema, Ed.D.
Syracuse University

June 1, 1965--October 31, 1965

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to
Contract OE-5-10-400 with the United States Department
of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Office of Education

1965

A review of the literature indicated a need to study the value-beliefs of institutionalized, educable mentally retarded (EMR), delinquent, adolescent males.

The need was established, in part, on the contention that the residential institution, acting as foster parent and assuming the child-rearing responsibilities of the family, would be concerned with the values of its wards.

The primary research hypothesis was concerned with the relative influence of time-in-residence on selected value-beliefs of institutionalized subjects as measured by the *Personal VEMS* and *Impersonal VEMS* tests developed by Gardner and Thompson.

This study utilized 58 subjects selected from the populations of two New York State Schools for the mentally retarded. The subjects could be characterized as institutionalized, lower-class, delinquent, adolescent males of familial, cultural-familial, or undifferentiated etiology.

Comparisons made between residential groups and between racial groups revealed few differences in mean

value-beliefs measured on the Personal VEMS test. Similar comparisons revealed no differences in mean value-beliefs measured on the Impersonal VEMS test. Comparisons made between time-in-residence (TIR) groups revealed no significant differences in mean value-beliefs measured on the two instruments.

Correlation coefficients were calculated between value-belief scores on the two instruments and time-in-residence for the total sample and 5 TIR groups. For the total sample, coefficients derived between time-in-residence and the 13 values measured were not significant at the .05 level of confidence. A total of 9 of 64 coefficients, however, were significant for the 5 TIR groups.

The major hypothesis that there would be significant differences in the value-beliefs of the subjects related to time-in-residence and changes in specific value-beliefs were rejected.

Several interpretations were made for these findings. Among the considerations were 1) the emphasis and effectiveness of teaching, 2) the prestige of the teacher, and 3) the interference of other agencies. Factors also considered were that the EMR delinquent may reject the teachings of the institution, or he may be incapable of learning those values measured by the Gardner-Thompson scales.

This study, as other studies, failed to show any significant difference in the verbally expressed ethical and moral values of delinquents and nondelinquents. It seems more likely that the delinquent group studied differs not so much in the broad value-beliefs they hold as in the means and behavioral style by which they realize their goals.

Indicated by the study was the need for further research in the area of value-beliefs related to treatment and training of institutionalized, EMR delinquents.

THE EFFECT OF INSTITUTION LIVING ON THE VALUE-BELIEFS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED, DELINQUENT, ADOLESCENT MALES

by

DAVID E. LEMA

A. A., Stockton College, 1949
B. A., San Jose State College, 1957
M. A., San Jose State College, 1960

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Education in the Graduate
Division of the School of Education at
Syracuse University,
August, 1965

Approved______________________________

Date______________________________

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

TO

NANCY

The one person who makes life worthwhile
through her love, patience and understanding.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is aware that the assistance and contributions of many individuals and agencies made this investigation and the entire course of doctoral study possible.

Noteworthy was the climate and atmosphere conducive to academic exploration and the time provided by Dr. William M. Cruickshank, Director, Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation, Syracuse University.

Highly prized was the encouragement and support extended by Dr. G. Orville Johnson, Committee Chairman and major professor, whose writings and teachings pointed out the need to investigate the values of delinquent youth with retarded mental development.

Valued was the constructive criticism of Dr. Andrew L. Shotick, Dr. Peter Knoblock, and Dr. Marvin Gold during the development of the dissertation.

Greatly appreciated was the complete cooperation of Dr. Charles Greenberg, Director, Rome State School, and Dr. Jacob Schneider, Director, Syracuse State School, and their staffs throughout the research phase of the study.

Recognition is extended to Dr. Eric F. Gardner and Dr. George G. Thompson, authors of the instruments used in the study, for permission to duplicate the scales. Appreciated was the assistance offered by Dr. John Junkala and Mr. Douglas Howard in testing delinquent subjects.

Recognized is the valuable statistical assistance received from Dr. David A. Payne, Dr. Eric Gardner, and Mr. John Pelosi. The author conveys his thanks for the guidance received from Mr. Pelosi during the analyses of data.

The computations of testing results were supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant GP-1137 through the Syracuse University Computing Center.

Financial assistance from an Elks Foundation summer grant and two fellowships under PL 85-926 awarded by the Division of Special Education, Syracuse University, and the California State Department of Education were most helpful. Instrumental in making these awards were Dr. William M. Cruickshank and Dr. G. Orville Johnson of Syracuse University and Miss Flora Daly and Mr. Richard Outland of the California Bureau of Special Education.

The research reported herein was generously supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as Project S-360, Small Contract No. OE-5-10-400.

Recognized, also, must be the assistance of Mrs. Jean Gilman, Mrs. Shirley Savlov, and Mrs. Dorothy Farrell in the final preparation of the manuscript.

Unknown were the sacrifices made by Nancy, Kathy, Jackie, Diane, and Greg.

To all mentioned the author is deeply indebted.

CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES xii

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS xvi

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 1
Background 2
Significance of the Problem 12
Definition of Terms 22
Assumptions 25
Questions and Hypotheses 27

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 29

Moral Judgments and Mental Retardation . . 29
Juvenile Delinquency 37
Intelligence and Delinquency 49
Institutions and the EMR Delinquent . . . 59

New York State Institutions 65

Syracuse State School 67
Syracuse State School Training Program 70
Rome State School 71
Training Program 72

III. DESIGN AND PROCEDURE 74

Subjects 74

Criteria and Procedure for Selection . 74

Chronological Age 75
Reason for Commitment 77
Socioeconomic Status 78

Chapter Page

Race 83
Sex 83
Age-at-Admission 84
Time-in-Residence 84

Summary Selection Criteria 85
Design 87
Selection Procedure 89

Description of the Groups 91

Chronological Age 91
Time-in-Residence 94
Intelligence Quotient 97
Summary 99

Description of the Sub-Groups Within the Total Sample 100

Chronological Age Sub-Groups 100

CA-12 Group 102
CA-13 Group 102
CA-14 Group 102
CA-15 Group 103
CA-16 Group 103

Comparison of the Five CA Groups on TIR, IQ, and CA 104
Time-in-Residence Sub-Groups 105

TIR-1 Group 105
TIR-2 Group 106
TIR-3 Group 106
TIR-4 Group 106
TIR-5 Group 107

Comparison of the Five TIR Groups on CA, IQ, and TIR 107

Instrumentation 109

Administration of Tests 116
Scoring the Gardner-Thompson Scales . 117

Analysis of Data 118

Chapter Page

IV. RESULTS 120

Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the Total Sample, RSS, SSS, SSS-A, SSS-B, and White Groups 121

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the RSS and SSS Groups 123

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the RSS and SSS-A Groups 123

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the RSS and SSS-B Groups 126

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the SSS-A and SSS-B Groups 126

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the WHITE and SSS-B Groups 129

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the Total Sample and the Ninth Grade Normative Group 131

Summary 131

Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS for the Total Sample and the RSS, SSS, SSS-A, SSS-B, WHITE, and Ninth Grade Normative Groups 133

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for the RSS and SSS Groups 135

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for the RSS and SSS-A Groups 135

Chapter Page

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Test for the RSS and SSS-B Groups 138

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Test for the SSS-A and SSS-B Groups 140

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Test for the WHITE and SSS-B Groups 140

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Test for Total Sample and the 108 Ninth Grade Boys 142

Summary 142

Mean Scores Obtained on the _Personal_ _VEMS_ Test for Five Chronological Age Groupings 143

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the _Personal_ _VEMS_ Test for the Five CA Groups 144

Mean Scores Obtained on the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Test for Five Chronological Age Groupings 149

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Test for the Five CA Groups 149

Mean Scores Obtained on the _Personal_ _VEMS_ Test for Five Time-in-Residence Groupings 152

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the _Personal_ _VEMS_ Test for the Five TIR Groups 154

Mean Scores Obtained on the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Test for Five Time-in-Residence Groupings 157

Chapter Page

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for the Five TIR Groups 159
Summary 159

Relationship Between Time-in-Residence and Value-Belief Scores 161

Relationship Between Time-in-Residence and Value-Belief Scores for the Total Sample 161
Relationship Between Time-in-Residence and Value-Belief Scores for the Five TIR Groups 163
Personal VEMS 164
Impersonal VEMS 165
Summary 186

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION 188

Summary 188
Discussion 195
Implications for Further Research 207

APPENDICES

A. CHARACTERISTICS OF SUBJECTS 214

B. PERSONAL AND IMPERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENTS . . .

C. SCORES OBTAINED ON THE PERSONAL AND IMPERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENTS . . . .

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . .

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA . . . .

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Status of the Total Sample and Five Groupings on Chronological Age 92

2. Status of the Total Sample and Five Groupings on Time-in-Residence 95

3. Status of the Total Sample and Five Groupings on Intelligence Quotient . . . 98

4. Status of Ten Sub-Groupings on Chronological Age, Time-in-Residence, and Intelligence Quotient 101

5. Comparison of the Five Chronological Age Groups on Time-in-Residence and Intelligence Quotient 104

6. Comparison of the Five Time-in-Residence Groups on Chronological Age and Intelligence Quotient 108

7. F-Values Obtained in the Comparison of the Five TIR Groups on Chronological Age . . 109

8. Means and Standard Deviations Obtained With the Personal VEMS Instrument for the Total Sample and Sub-Groupings Established on Institution and Race Compared With Ninth Grade Boys from Central New York Suburban Schools 122

9. Means, Standard Deviations, F-Values, and *t*'s Obtained With the Personal VEMS Instrument for the Rome State School (RSS) and Syracuse State School (SSS) Groups . 124

Table Page

10. Means, Standard Deviations, F-Values, and _t_'s Obtained With the _Personal_ _VEMS_ Instrument for the Rome State School (RSS) and Syracuse State School White (SSS-A) Groups 125

11. Means, Standard Deviations, F-Values and _t_'s Obtained With the _Personal_ _VEMS_ Instrument for the Rome State School (RSS) and Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) Groups 127

12. Means, Standard Deviations, F-Values, and _t_'s Obtained With the _Personal_ _VEMS_ Instrument for the Syracuse State School White (SSS-A) and Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) Groups 128

13. Means, Standard Deviations, F-Values, and _t_'s Obtained With the Personal VEMS Instrument for the Combined Rome and Syracuse State School White (WHITE) and Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) Groups . . 130

14. Means and Standard Deviations Obtained With the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Instrument for the Total Sample and Sub-Groupings Established on Institution and Race Compared With Ninth Grade Boys from Central New York Suburban Schools 134

15. Means, Standard Deviations, F-Values, and _t_'s Obtained With the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Instrument for the Rome State School (RSS) and Syracuse State School (SSS) Groups . . . 136

16. Means, Standard Deviations, F-Values, and _t_'s Obtained With the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Instrument for the Rome State School (RSS) and Syracuse State School White (SSS-A) Groups 137

Table Page

17. Means, Standard Deviations, F-Values, and _t_'s Obtained With the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Instrument for the Rome State School (RSS) and Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) Groups 139

18. Means, Standard Deviations, F-Values, and _t_'s Obtained With the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Instrument for the Syracuse State School White (SSS-A) and Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) Groups 141

19. Means, Standard Deviations, F-Values, and _t_'s Obtained With the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Instrument for the Combined Rome and Syracuse State School White (WHITE) and Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) Groups 141

20. Means and Standard Deviations Obtained With the _Personal_ _VEMS_ Instrument for Five Chronological Age Groups at Two New York State Schools for the Mentally Retarded and for Ninth Grade Boys from Central New York Suburban Schools 145

21. Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Values Obtained With the _Personal_ _VEMS_ Instrument for the Five Chronological Age Groups 146

22. Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Values Obtained Between Pairs of Means for All Pairings of the Five Chronological Age Groups on _Truthfulness_ and _Conformity_ Measured by the _Personal_ _VEMS_ Test 148

23. Means and Standard Deviations Obtained With the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ Instrument for Five Chronological Age Groups at Two New York State Schools for the Mentally Retarded, the Total Sample, and Ninth Grade Boys from Central New York Suburban Schools 150

Table Page

24. Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Values Obtained With the Impersonal VEMS Instrument for the Five Chronological Age Groups 151

25. Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Values Obtained Between Pairs of Means for All Pairings of the Five Chronological Age Groups on Loyalty Measured by the the Impersonal VEMS Instrument 153

26. Means and Standard Deviations Obtained With the Personal VEMS Instrument for Five Time-in-Residence Groups and the Total Sample from Two New York State Schools for the Mentally Retarded With Ninth Grade Boys from Central New York Suburban Schools 155

27. Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Values Obtained With the Personal VEMS Instrument for the Five Time-in-Residence Groups 156

28. Means and Standard Deviations Obtained With the Impersonal VEMS Instrument for Five Time-in-Residence Groups and the Total Sample from Two New York State Schools for the Mentally Retarded and for Ninth Grade Boys from Central New York Suburban Schools 158

29. Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Values Obtained With the Impersonal VEMS Instrument for the Five Time-in-Residence Groups 160

30. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients Between Value-Belief Scores and TIR for the Total Sample and Five TIR Groups 162

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure Page

1. Test Design of TIR Grouping 88

2. Time-in-Residence (TIR) Group Assignments . . 164

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The present study was directed toward the investigation of the effect of institution living on the value-beliefs of educable mentally retarded, delinquent, adolescent males. The study was designed to investigate the stability or instability of the value systems of institutionalized persons by measuring values judged to be important in their interpersonal relationships. It was an attempt to determine the effect an institution experience might have on selected ethical, moral, and social values acknowledged by persons committed to an institution for engaging in immoral, illegal, and/or antisocial acts.

The responsibility of the home and school as agents in the formulation of children's values is recognized in the literature.[1, 2, 3, 4] It seemed important,

---

[1] Clyde Kluckhohn, "Education, Values, and Anthropological Relativity," Culture and Behavior, ed. Richard Kluckhohn (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962), pp. 286-300.

[2] Edna Ambrose and Alice Miel, Children's Social Learning (Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1958).

[3] R. Freeman Butts, A Cultural History of Western Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955), pp. 1-3.

[4] Educational Policies Commission, Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools (Washington: Educational Policies Commission, 1951).

then, to examine what influence an institution, which has assumed the total responsibility of the home and school, has on the value-beliefs of its wards.

Background

Compulsory education laws, coupled with mandatory provisions for mentally retarded youth, have stimulated the growth of public school educational programs for many children once regarded as unable to profit from academic instruction.[1] Currently, there seems to be agreement that the educational needs of the majority of mentally retarded persons can be met in the community within the framework of the public educational system.[2, 3, 4, 5]

Although institution placement is not intended or recommended for the majority of mentally retarded persons, there are still those for whom institution placement seems warranted. According to 1962 reports, there are over 200,000 mentally retarded persons, or approximately 4 per cent of the mentally retarded population with intelligence quotients below 70, in residential institutions.[1]

---

[1] G. Orville Johnson, "The Education of Mentally Handicapped Children," Education of Exceptional Children and Youth, ed. William M. Cruickshank and G. Orville Johnson (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), pp. 189-226.

[2] Samuel Kirk and G. Orville Johnson, Educating the Retarded Child (Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951).

[3] J. E. Wallace Wallin, Education of Mentally Handicapped Children (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955).

[4] Christine P. Ingram, Education of the Slow-Learning Child (2d Ed.; New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1953).

[5] G. Orville Johnson, Education for the Slow Learners (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963).

Permanent placement for lifetime custodial care and protection is usually recommended or practiced sometime in the life of severely retarded and grossly defective persons.[2] These persons, who constitute the larger grouping within the institutionalized population, have been described and discussed in an extensive literature.[3, 4, 5] In general, these people are so intellectually retarded that they are better cared for and sheltered in the more protective environment.

---

[1] President's Panel on Mental Retardation, *A Proposed Program for National Action to Combat Mental Retardation* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962), p. 131.

[2] William M. Cruickshank, "Planning for the Severely Retarded Child," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXI (July, 1956), 3-9.

[3] *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, Published Bi-monthly by the American Association on Mental Deficiency, P.O. Box 96, Willimantic, Connecticut.

[4] *The Training School Bulletin*, Published Quarterly by the Training School at Vineland, New Jersey.

[5] Harold M. Williams and J. E. Wallace Wallin, *Education of the Severely Retarded Child*, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education Bulletin 1959, No. 12 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959).

A less permanent or temporary placement is available for educable mentally retarded (EMR), or mildly retarded persons. In general, the institutionalized EMR may be classified as 1) dependent and neglected persons for whom no other placement is immediately available, and 2) emotionally disturbed, socially maladjusted, or delinquent persons who cannot be cared for in the community because of their emotional or behavioral problem.[1] Recent studies of variables associated with institution placement of EMR persons reveal that factors other than low intelligence are associated with their placement.

Hobbs[2] reports that a higher incidence of anti-social or immoral behavior differentiates institutionalized from non-institutionalized EMR adolescents and young adults of comparable IQ, sex, and age.

Guthrie, Butler and Gorlow[3] found that institutionalized adolescent girls, in contrast to non-institutionalized adolescent females, reported they were easily upset or excited, had bad tempers, felt they were nuisances, and acknowledged difficulties with swearing, cheating, and fighting.

---

[1] William I. Gardner and Herschel W. Nisonger, "A Manual on Program Development in Mental Retardation," Monograph Supplement, American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXVI, No. 4 (January 1962), 90-92.

[2] Mary T. Hobbs, "A Comparison of Institutionalized and Non-Institutionalized Mentally Retarded," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXIX, No. 2 (September 1964), 206-10.

[3] George M. Guthrie, Alfred Butler, and Leon Gorlow, "Personality Differences between Institutionalized and Non-Institutionalized Retardates," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXVII, No. 4 (January 1963), 543-48.

Saenger's[1] New York City report reveals several social variables influencing the placement of mentally retarded persons with IQs in the 50 to 75 range. He found that, while placement was related to family income and ethnic background, the primary factor influencing placement was the out-of-home behavior of the EMR person.

These reports indicate that behavior problems exhibited in the form of delinquent acts, violation of the law, or participation in prohibited acts or proscribed activities are instrumental in the placement of EMR adolescents in residential schools and institutions for the mentally retarded.

These institution placement reports run parallel with recent Federal Bureau of Investigation juvenile arrest reports which indicate that over one million youth under age 21 were arrested in 1962.[2] Of the arrested boys and girls, almost 400,000 were under 16 years of age.

---

[1] Gerhart Saenger, Factors Influencing the Institutionalization of Mentally Retarded Individuals in New York City (Albany: State Interdepartmental Health Resources Board, 1960).

[2] Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, 1962, XXXIII (Washington: Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1963).

The prevalence of delinquent behavior in juveniles, whatever their intellectual level, has led to a heightened interest in whether the home and school are fulfilling their functions in character development, citizenship education, and the teaching of moral-social values. Rafferty[1] expresses fear of and concern with "the slob" in his description of the extreme behavior of some adolescents.

This concern is closely related to a recent statement made by Arthur S. Adams, President of the American Council on Education.[2] Adams expresses the point of view that scientific advances in recent years have made us more aware of the need to develop, in oncoming generations, a strength of character to correspond with the responsibilities of tomorrow's leaders.

Adams' subject, however, was the influence of the college on student character. Since many people would not consider EMR adolescents potential college students or community leaders, his comment in reference to the retarded might appropriately be restated: "to develop in oncoming generations a strength of character to correspond with the responsibilities of tomorrow's (followers)."

---

[1] Max Rafferty, "The Cult of the Slob," Phi Delta Kappan, XL, No. 2 (November, 1958).

[2] Arthur S. Adams, "Foreword," The College Influence on Student Character, ed. Edward D. Eddy, Jr., Mark L. Parkhurst, and James S. Yakovakis (Washington: American Council on Education, 1959), p. v.

Abrahamsen has observed that not all people possess the qualifications needed to become successful in any given endeavor. In fact, only a few seem able to compete for the higher honors, and not all obtain their objective. In Abrahamsen's opinion, many who are "pushed aside" refuse to accept failure and try again to better themselves:

> New frustrations arise in them with each new pushing around from their social milieu. They become resentful and hostile. And then they begin to discover "short cuts," to help themselves in various ways, including lawless ones.[1]

A review of the legal, psychological, and sociological aspects of delinquency points up numerous and complex factors contributing to and associated with delinquent behavior.[2] Abrahamsen's "short cut" theory must be considered among these factors, especially since time-saving devices and "short cut" techniques have become part of the modern American home and culture.

Johnson,[3] in discussing the delinquent behavior of the slow learner, suggests that such behavior is a possible substitution or compensation for behavior the slow learner is unable to achieve. Johnson also considers delinquent behavior as a reflection of the value systems of a social group that places a premium on delinquent acts.

---

[1] David Abrahamsen, Who Are the Guilty (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1952), p. 7.

[2] Sophia M. Robison, Juvenile Delinquency: Its Nature and Control (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1960).

[3] Johnson, Education for the Slow Learners, pp. 50-57, 308-309.

Thompson[1] points out that a child's development of moral-social values, which constitutes only one of many factors related to delinquent behavior, is nevertheless an important factor in the evaluation of the problem.

It is maintained by Gardner and Thompson[2] that much behavior in interaction with others appears to be governed by adherence to certain social, ethical, and moral values. Certain forms of behavior which deviate from the accepted values of our culture may be termed unacceptable, undesirable, unethical, antisocial, or immoral.

Rogers states this notion when she defines morals as:

> . . . standards of right and wrong; and these standards are determined for every human being by the values of the culture of which he is a part. Moral Behavior, in turn, embraces actions of

---

[1] George G. Thompson, Child Psychology (Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1952), pp. 576-79.

[2] Eric F. Gardner and George G. Thompson, "Investigation and Measurement of the Social Values Governing Interpersonal Relations Among Adolescent Youth and Their Teachers," Cooperative Research Project No. 259A (8418)SU and 259B (8418)OSU, Syracuse University and Ohio State University, 1963. (Mimeographed.)

> social concern. These forms of behavior which are judged to be ultimately conducive to social advantage are called moral and right; those which are judged adverse to social good are called immoral and wrong.[1]

According to Stephens,[2] delinquency is an extreme form of immorality.

Johnson's concern with the delinquent behavior of youth led him to propose a two-fold solution: he recommends that a program be developed which would consider the learning and developmental characteristics of learners as well as a meaningful curriculum content related to the learners' environmental and experiential background. In addition, Johnson maintains that

> . . . a value system that places a premium on socially acceptable behavior must be taught and substituted for the one presently accepted.[3]

Rothstein[4] says that the present-day residential institution provides for mentally retarded persons programs which stress both treatment and training, with an emphasis on habilitation and the return to the community of those retarded individuals who exhibit the potential to return.

---

[1] Dorothy Rogers, The Psychology of Adolescence (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962), p. 220.

[2] John M. Stephens, Educational Psychology (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1951), p. 550.

[3] Johnson, Education for the Slow Learners, p. 55.

[4] Jerome Rothstein (ed.), Mental Retardation: Readings and Resources (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961), p. 388.

Windle[1] expects the institution, as a patient-treatment center, to provide the kinds of treatment, rehabilitation, and training services that will lead toward a modification of delinquent behaviors.

Gardner and Nisonger[2] describe the institution as being a care, treatment, and training center for a select group of mentally retarded persons whose emotional, physical, neurological, behavioral, and management needs cannot be met in the community in a non-residential program. Although they hold that the institution's primary role is _not_ education and training, they acknowledge that these functions are vital elements in a treatment-therapeutic program.

Guiding current thinking and practice, the _American Association on Mental Deficiency_ (_AAMD_) states:

> Treatment in the institution encompasses the prevention, amelioration, _cure_ and _rehabilitation_ of physical, mental and social disorders.[3]

If delinquency is considered as behavior which deviates from the behavioral standards set by certain values held within the dominant American culture, an investigation of the values held by delinquent EMR youth would be relevant and important to persons concerned with their rehabilitation.

---

[1] Charles Windle, "Prognosis of Mental Subnormals," Monograph Supplement, _American Association of Mental Deficiency_, LXVI, No. 5 (March, 1962), 107.

[2] William I. Gardner and Nisonger, _op_. _cit_., pp. 90-92.

[3] "Standards for State Residential Institutions for the Mentally Retarded," Monograph Supplement, _American Journal of Mental Deficiency_, LXVIII, No. 4 (January, 1964), 2.

Because deviation from or disregard for certain values upon which the dominant American culture places a high premium appears to lead to the institutionalization of EMR adolescents, it would seem that the institution's treatment program would be oriented toward changing the value complex of those who subscribe to a deviant value system.

Institution treatment which would encompass the amelioration, cure, and rehabilitation of social disorders needs to take into account the value-beliefs of those patients being treated for those disorders; if EMR delinquents constitute a socially unique group in value orientation, that value orientation is an important factor for consideration in the successful handling of patients by an institution treatment staff.

There are no reports in the literature describing the effect of an institution treatment-training program or of institution living on the value-beliefs of EMR delinquent adolescents.

The present study was directed toward the investigation of the effect of institution living on the value-beliefs of educable mentally retarded, delinquent, adolescent males. The study was designed to investigate the stability or instability of the value systems of institutionalized persons, by measuring values judged to be important in their interpersonal relationships. It was an attempt to determine the effect an institution experience might have on selected ethical, moral, and social values acknowledged by persons committed to an institution for engaging in immoral, illegal, and/or antisocial acts.

Significance of the Problem

The significance of this problem has a basis in the philosophy of education. Van Cleve Morris[1] explains that a primary consideration of philosophy is the asking of what is right conduct, an area in which one deals, not so much with reality or with truth, as with values. The question of ethics, the determination of what is right conduct, comes under axiology, the study of values. As Morris[1] points out, educators are concerned not only with the transmission of knowledge, but also with the recommendation of certain value systems to the young.

---

[1] Van Cleve Morris, Philosophy and the American School (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961), pp. 20-21.

Whether it is the educator's privilege or duty to go beyond the perpetuation of a value system to criticism of it or encouragement to students to criticize society's values, is a question which is answered differently by different schools of axiological thought. It is not within the scope of this paper either to compare or to argue axiologies. It is important, however, to note that the field of value and an educational theory of valuing should be an important area of inquiry, relevant to education research.

From the educator-practitioner viewpoint, one important task of education is the transmission of society's values. Harold Benjamin notes:

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 219-321.

> . . . in all ages and all societies some provision has been made to pass on to succeeding generations the knowledge and the values which were fundamental to the culture.[1]

This same view is expressed by Clyde Kluckhohn:

> From primitive tribes to Egypt, China, Greece, and the Christian world in its flower, the task of education has been first and foremost that of transmitting, expounding, and in some cases refining the great values of each culture. The teaching of information and of skills, until recently, has been essentially little more than a means to the more ultimate end.[2]

Residential institutions for the mentally retarded receive for treatment delinquent educable mentally retarded persons and have been noted for their importance in a total state educational program for the mentally retarded by Cruickshank.[3] He maintains that not only may the professional skills of many disciplines be organized into an effective program for the severely and multi-handicapped, but they may also be organized for those educable mentally retarded (EMR) persons who display an inability to adjust to the community.

---

[1] Harold Benjamin, "The Problems of Education," An Outline of Man's Knowledge of the Modern World, ed. Lyman Bryson (Garden City: Nelson Doubleday, Inc., 1960), p. 374.

[2] Kluckhohn, op. cit., p. 287.

[3] William M. Cruickshank, "Current Educational Practice With Exceptional Children," Education of Exceptional Children and Youth, ed. William M. Cruickshank and G. Orville Johnson (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), pp. 43-93.

Cruickshank[1] points out that where, in the past, serious criticism had been leveled against the residential schools, present-day public school and residential school educators find agreement and similarity in their educational philosophy and methodology.

In recent years, special educational programs for EMR youth have stated as objectives the advancement of personal, social, and economic adjustment.[2] Kirk and Johnson[3] and Martens[4] hold that consideration must be given not only to essential academic skills and knowledge, but also to the social skills and values important to personal, social, and vocational success.

If, as Cruickshank maintains, the institution is part of a total state educational system, it would seem the institution would also be concerned with the social skills and values important to personal, social, and vocational success of EMR patients. It, too, should be involved in recommending a value system to the young, passing on values fundamental to the American culture, or transmitting, expounding, and, in some cases, refining the values of our culture. This involvement would seem to have great emphasis when working with delinquent EMR adolescents who appear to reject, ignore, or in some way depart from the commonly accepted value standards of our society.

---

[1] *Ibid*., pp. 55-58.

[2] Kirk and Johnson, *op*. *cit*.

[3] *Ibid*., pp. 115-21.

[4] Elise Martens, *Curriculum Adjustments for the Mentally Retarded*, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Bulletin 1954, No. 2 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957).

Results of this investigation could offer insights into the behavior of delinquent retardates and could have implications for curriculum development within the institution. In order to develop programs which promote personal and social adjustment, especially for persons whose behaviors suggest inadequacies in that adjustment, it seems important to determine how delinquents think they ought to behave and what they think they ought to say and do in personal and social situations.

As stated by Gardner and Thompson,[1] much human behavior related to social interactions appears to be governed by adherence or subscription to certain social, ethical, and moral values. Theoretically, values are influential in determining what behaviors an individual will display and in what activities he will engage.[2]

---

[1] Eric F. Gardner and George G. Thompson, op. cit.

[2] Thompson, op. cit.

Reports in the literature indicate that an individual's values influence his adjustment.[1]

Shorr[2] states that evidence of the importance of value systems as an organizing and motivating factor in behavior has been accepted. Kuhlen[3] explains that although values are not the sole determiners of behavior, they do represent a major aspect of the motivational make-up of an individual. Because much of an individual's behavior is guided by principles of what he considers to be right and wrong, teachers and parents attempt to teach values such as honesty, truthfulness, and loyalty to influence behavior in positive directions.[4]

The most recent statement made by the American Association on Mental Deficiency (AAMD) concerning philosophy and standards for residential institutions suggests the depth of the institution's involvement in this important area of the child's development.

---

[1] J. Kalhorn, "Studies in Topological and Vector Psychology: III, Values and Sources of Authority Among Rural Children," *University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare*, XX (1945).

[2] Joseph E. Shorr, "The Development of a Test to Measure the Intensity of Values," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XLIV (May, 1953), 266-74.

[3] Raymond Kuhlen, *The Psychology of Adolescent Development* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), p. 245.

[4] Sidney L. Pressey and Raymond G. Kuhlen, *Psychological Development Through the Life Span* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 436.

> While the institution, by virtue of its administrative and physical nature, cannot emulate the family and the community, it must in its own way provide the individual with the protection and attention required for his growth and development. In this sense care and attention transcend shelter and nourishment.[1]

Although it is realized that the institution cannot emulate the family, it must be recognized that whatever responsibility for teaching values was charged to the parents in their rearing and training of their retarded child would need to be assumed by the institution acting _in loco parentis_. A search of the literature reveals no studies concerned with this important parental function of the institution.

The _AAMD_ statement that the institution "in its own way" must provide the attention required suggests the institution has a unique effect on the value-beliefs of its wards. While it seems reasonable to expect the institution to attempt to effect a value-belief orientation somewhat similar to that of the open community, it is recognized that the institution represents a life style which out of necessity is different from that of the wider community.

---

[1] "Standards for State Residential Institutions for the Mentally Retarded," p. 2.

One might expect, then, the institution would place a different emphasis on certain values. Recent research by Edgerton[1] on the "patient elite" suggests that the institution effects a value-belief orientation unique unto itself.

The indication that the administrative and physical nature of the institution is unique suggests another aspect of the significance of this problem. Wallin,[2] primarily concerned with the institution's long-term patients, visioned the institution as a well-organized community consisting of parks and playgrounds, farms, orchards, cottages, gardens, shops, a chapel, a school, a hospital, and other "physical appointments." He insists that the institution should be infused with "the spirit and processes of a genuine democracy," organized and administered as a cooperative, self-directing, self-policing community.

Wallin's institution-community model serves not only to illustrate a functional level the institution might maintain in a total state program, but also suggests that certain values are expressed by the physical arrangements and architectural structure of the facility.

---

[1] Robert B. Edgerton, "A Patient Elite: Ethnography in a Hospital for the Mentally Retarded," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, XLVIII, No. 3 (November, 1963), 372-85.

[2] J. E. Wallace Wallin, Mental Deficiency (Brandon, Vermont: Journal of Clinical Psychology Press, 1956), pp. 164-66.

As Morris[1] illustrated, some educators would say that the physical situation is not the important thing in training children; the importance lies in the human situation, the quality of teaching. To these educators, teaching may be carried on in any well-ventilated attic or cellar.

Other educators would say that the architectural structure of the buildings and the physical nature of the facility set the tone, mood, and feeling of what is going on inside of them. To these educators, the physical building is a monument, a remembrance of an age, an expression of some value.[2]

As a physical facility, the institution is different from that in which an EMR adolescent is usually reared. Because of this, one wonders what effect the institution setting may have on the value-beliefs of patients. Results of an investigation to explore the effect of institution living on the value-beliefs of its patients might have implications for institution management and construction.

---

[1] Morris, _op_. _cit_., pp. 440-43.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 442.

The fact that the state institution exists and is supported by the state implies that it is of benefit to the state's citizens. It seems reasonable to expect the institution to benefit its patients. Wallin's[1] institution-community model was developed from a basic consideration that when persons are to be confined for an extended period, the institution must offer benefits beyond custody, supervision, protection, and restraint.

Placement of an EMR delinquent suggests that he is in need of a period of special treatment or training away from his home and community. It follows that institution placement is made on the premise that the institution offers the treatment or training needed. It seems reasonable for court officials and parents to expect youth so placed to benefit or improve in some way as a result of that treatment and/or institution experience. Therefore, it seems important to determine the effect of that institution experience on the value-beliefs of EMR delinquents.

---

[1] Wallin, op. cit.

Definition of Terms

Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR) and Mentally Handicapped are synonomous terms and refer to youth with intelligence quotients (IQs) ranging from 50 through 79 as measured by an individually administered psychological examination.

Delinquency refers to behavior considered offending either by neglect or violation of law whether it resulted in arrest by police authorities or not. Examples of this behavior include such acts as habitual truancy, running away from home, stealing, theft, and shop lifting. It encompasses such terms as incorrigibility, unmanageableness, and ungovernability. It includes, although is not limited by, the legal definition of delinquency which refers to youth so adjudicated by a court.

Values and Value-beliefs refers to what Smith, Stanley and Shores define as rules of conduct by which people shape their behavior. They point out that people express two kinds of belief:

> One has reference to what a given set of circumstances actually *is*, or *was*; the other, to what it *ought* to be or *ought* to have been. The first of these is usually referred to as facts; the second, as valuations, judgments, opinions. In their valuations people express their beliefs both as to what the facts are and their sense of what is right, honest, fair, desirable, most worth while--that is, their values. Their values are frequently expressed as maxims, such as "honesty is the best policy" and "treat thy neighbor as thyself." In short, the values of people are the rules of conduct by which they shape their behavior. . . .[1]

For purposes of this investigation, honesty, truthfulness, loyalty, conformity, kindness, generosity, and impunitiveness will be examined. These selected value-beliefs are defined by Gardner and Thompson:

> *Loyalty*: sticking with a friend, never embarrassing or offending him, going along with his wishes as much as possible.
>
> *Honesty*: actions or intentions directed toward fair dealing so that each individual acquires or retains whatever is properly his; e.g., returning goods to proper owner that may have come into one's possession by error.
>
> *Truthfulness*: verbalizations of reality by the individual without known distortion.

---

[1] B. Othanel Smith, William O. Stanley, and J. Harlan Shores, *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development* (Rev. ed.; Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Co., 1957), pp. 59-60.

Kindness: being nurturant (helpful or protective) toward another preceived as being in need of succorance (aid, comfort, sympathy, or understanding). Person is in respondent's physical presence when the need for succorance is perceived.

Generosity: giving some of one's worldly goods, praise, or approval to another without regard for personal sacrifice or without expectation or hope that recipient will ever become aware of the generous action.

Conformity: going along with or acquiescing to the concensus of a group, accepting their opinions, attitudes, and decisions even though in opposition to one's own.

Impunitiveness: being impunitive or "blind" to conflicts and hostilities, ignoring issues, avoiding the taking of sides, changing the subject when conflicts arise, offering compromise interpretations or solutions, generally "smoothing things over," avoiding commitments, and favoring tactfulness whenever possible.[1]

Character refers to intelligent direction and purposeful control of conduct by definite moral principles.[2]

Value System pertains to the pattern of responses elicited on the Gardner-Thompson Scales: Personal VEMS test and Impersonal VEMS test.[3]

Personal VEMS test is described in Chapter III under section on instrumentation and is shown in Appendix B.

---

[1] Eric F. Gardner and George G. Thompson, *op. cit.*, Chap. 2, pp. 5-6.

[2] Eddy, Parkhurst, and Yakovakokis, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[3] Eric F. Gardner and George G. Thompson, *op. cit.*

Impersonal VEMS test is described in Chapter III under section titled instrumentation and is shown in Appendix B.

Value Hierarchy pertains to the value rankings of responses elicited on the Personal VEMS and Impersonal VEMS tests.

Adolescent refers to youth ranging in age from 12-0 years through 16-6 years.

Institutionalize and Institutionalization refers to confinement or placement in a 24-hour residential school, center, or institution.

Assumptions

Certain assumptions were necessary to the development of this study. Principal among these were:

1. The EMR adolescent has an adequate intellectual ability, which permits socialization. He is able to learn to manipulate concepts and symbols; can imagine himself in the past or future; can identify with the feelings and thoughts of others; and can internalize standards and values by which to guide his behavior.

2. The EMR adolescent's intellectual ability, limited as it may be, allows him to understand his ongoing society, to function within it, to judge it, and to modify it. It is assumed that he is capable of learning the patterns, symbols, expectations, and feelings of his culture.
3. Society considers the EMR adolescent responsible for his acts.
4. Among the responsibilities of a residential institution are a concern for the moral or character development of its wards.
5. While basic convictions and values are formed in the early rearing of the child, the residential institution is obligated to modify convictions and values of delinquent wards toward good.
6. The Gardner-Thompson Scales, as utilized in this study, adequately measure the value-beliefs of the subjects selected.

Questions and Hypotheses[1]

Reports in the literature infer that institution experience influences the psychological growth and behavior tendencies of patients. This inference leads to the general hypothesis that institutionalized persons will manifest differences relative to length of time in residence. This investigation attempts to answer the following questions:

1. Are the value-beliefs of delinquent, educable mentally retarded, adolescent males affected by an institution experience?
2. What effect does institution living have on the value-beliefs of delinquent, educable mentally retarded, adolescent males?

It is hypothesized that:

H_1: There will be significant differences in the value-beliefs of institutionalized, delinquent, educable mentally retarded, adolescent males related to time-in-residence.

H_{1a}: Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become more conforming. (As time-in-residence increases, conformity scores will increase.)

---

[1] For explanation see Analysis of Data, chap. III, p. 119.

H_{1b}:Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become more impunitive. (As time-in-residence increases, impunitive scores will increase.)

H_{1c}:Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become more truthful. (As time-in-residence increases, truthfulness scores will increase.)

H_{1d}:Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become less loyal. (As time-in-residence increases, loyalty scores will decrease.)

H_{1e}:Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become less kind. (As time-in-residence increases, kindness scores will decrease.)

H_{1f}:Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become less generous. (As time-in-residence increases, generosity scores will decrease.)

H_{1g}:Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become less honest. (As time-in-residence increases, honesty scores will decrease.)

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Moral Judgments and Mental Retardation

The Bibliography of World Literature on Mental Retardation[1] provides nine listings concerned with the social values, moral problems, and morality of mentally retarded persons. Three[2, 3, 4] of these listings are foreign publications which do not appear as entries in the Syracuse University Library Catalog. One[5] entry seems to be in error as the search of the literature failed to produce it.

---

[1] The President's Panel on Mental Retardation, Bibliography of World Literature on Mental Retardation: January 1940-March 1963 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963).

[2] B. Bisio, "Oligophrenic Deficiency and Social Sensitivity. The Problem of Moral Judgment in Mental Defectives Based on the Combined Results of the Alexander, Rorschach and De Sanctis Tests," Revista Sperimentale Di Freniatria e Medicina Legale Delle Alienazioni Mentali (Reggio-Emilia); LXXXIV (1960), 204-47.

[3] James S. Cammade, Moral Problems of Mental Defect (London: Burns, Oates, 1945).

[4] James S. Cammack, Morality Problem with Feeblemindedness (Stockholm: Natur Och Kultur, 1947).

[5] Theordora M. Abel, "Moral Judgments of Subnormal Adolescent Girls," Psychological Bulletin, XXXVII (1940), 506.

Among the other five, one is a major research report concerned with the moral judgments of educable mentally retarded girls; two are discussions of the religious training of retardates; and two are reports of the same research and will be reviewed together.

The major research report found by this investigator concerned with the moral judgments of educable mentally retarded persons is that of Abel.[1] Because of the limited reporting on this topic, her paper will be outlined in detail.

Abel prefaces her research findings with an overview of some of Piaget's thinking. She notes that Piaget maintains that up to 8 or 9 years of age, the child makes evaluative judgments of both conduct and punishment of conduct in terms of "moral realism." For example, the child takes into account only the manifest content of an act and would consider the breaking of 15 cups accidentally as a more serious offense than the breaking of 1 cup voluntarily.

After the age of 8 or 9, the child is said to begin to make moral judgments by taking "subjective intent" into consideration. After the chronological age of 12 or so, the child behaves as an adult when making these judgments. To explore the concepts developed by Piaget in regard to mentally retarded persons, Abel undertook the following study.

---

[1] Theordora M. Abel, "Moral Judgments Among Subnormals," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXVI (1941), 378-92.

Ninety-four adolescent white girls with chronological ages 15 to 21, intelligence quotients 53 to 70, and mental ages 6 through 11 were selected for study. Seventy-four of the girls were institutionalized at Letchworth Village, New York; the other 20 attended trade adjustment classes at Manhattan High School for Women Garment Trades, New York City.

Twenty of the institutionalized girls were matched with the 20 community girls and presented with story situations by the technique suggested by Piaget. The stories concerned a situation in which a person engaged in an illegal act and later became involved in some difficulty. The girls were asked to decide why the person had the difficulty.

In studying the moral orientations of the girls, it was found that the types of moral judgment were influenced by the "constraint area" in which they were placed. Abel reports that institutionalization increases the frequency with which girls evaluate in terms of "moral realism." She found, further, that judgments of "moral realism" are to some extent more prevalent among subnormal girls who had been institutionalized a longer rather than a shorter time, and among girls who are "obedient" rather than recalcitrant to institution authorities.

Abel explains the "marked effects of institutionalization on the moral judgments of subnormal girls" by stating that institution authorities control their wards by means of "threats and punishments." Moreover, ". . . the whole atmosphere of a very large custodial institution is usually permeated by attitudes of moral realism. Order and discipline have to be maintained. There is not enough time nor a sufficient staff to consider individual differences in behavior. If a girl does something wrong, the deed rather than the motive . . ." is taken into account.

Abel concludes that her results indicate that in the training program at the institution level, more emphasis should be laid on developing moral judgments.

Bolduc[1, 2] reports his investigation to isolate and identify common patterns of solutions to social value-need conflict situations in mentally retarded persons. To measure social value-need conflicts, Bolduc constructed a scale consisting of 95 items. Each item was constructed so that the subject was required to make a forced-choice response, on the basis of what was believed to be the best choice, to a familiar social conflict situation. One choice depicted a social value and the opposite choice depicted a social need. The social value dimension was divided into honesty, loyalty, moral courage, and responsibility. The social need dimension consisted of nurturance, succorance, dominance, affiliation, and deference.

Bolduc administered the scale verbally to 50 white, female retardates between the ages of 14 and 18 with an IQ range of 55 to 80. Half of the girls were drawn from an institutionalized population in a state training school for females. The other 25 were drawn from a population of retarded girls of similar age, intelligence, race, and socio-economic status attending special education classes in 12 public schools.

---

[1] Thomas E. Bolduc, "Social Value-need Patterns in Mental Retardates," Dissertation Abstracts, XX (October-December, 1959), 1857-58.

[2] Thomas E. Bolduc, "Social Value-need Patterns in Mental Retardates," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXIV (1960), 472-79.

The institutionalized group is described as ". . . court committed because of failure to achieve a satisfactory social adjustment in the community." The community girls were said to have not been involved in court action for delinquent behavior.

Bolduc was able to differentiate the institutionalized girls from the noninstitutionalized on two factors. The institutionalized girls revealed:

> (1) The need to be dominant in their relationships with peer groups. Although values were recognized, they are frequently distorted and employed as weapons with which to gain dominance.
>
> (2) . . . a negative, rebellious approach to social situations involving authority figures, with an underlying need for affection and pleasurable activities dominating their behavior.[1]

Bolduc concluded that additional research should be undertaken to explore these two factors in depth.

In the area of religious training of the mentally retarded, Sister Mary Laurine[2] points out that teaching must be vivid, concrete, and greatly simplified in order to put across basic religious and moral truths. She outlines some basic materials that may be used to present religious instruction to mentally handicapped children.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Sister Mary Laurine, "How to Present Religious and Moral Truths to Mentally Handicapped Children," National Catholic Education Association Bulletin, LVIII (August, 1961), 417-18.

Kowrach[1] explains that the mentally retarded person needs moral training. He notes that moral defect need not follow mental defect. He is of the opinion that juvenile offenders with low intelligence are ". . . not criminals because they were deficient but rather because they lacked sympathetic moral training." Moral training to Kowrach may be provided by direct religious training through a released-time program during the school day.

Indirectly, the teacher may provide moral training to his class " . . . by his inspiration and example." Through example the teacher should be able to show children how to face problems honestly and courageously, how to overcome selfishness with generosity, and how to cultivate good habits of work with respect for persons and property.

To distinguish differences between "defective or psychopathic delinquents" and "nonpsychopathic defectives," Shotwell[2] studied two groups of girls at the Pacific Colony, Spadra, California. She cites the California Welfare and Institutions Code to define the "defective or psychopathic delinquent":

---

[1] Edward J. Kowrach, "Moral and Religious Aspects of the Problems of Retarded Children," Education, LXXVI, No. 2 (October, 1955), 102-106.

[2] Anna M. Shotwell, "A Study of Psychopathic Delinquency," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LI (July, 1946), 57-62.

> . . . as any minor who is mentally defective or psychopathic, and who is an habitual delinquent or has tendencies toward becoming an habitual delinquent, if his delinquency is such as to constitute a menace to the health, person, or property of himself or of any person, and the minor is not a proper subject for commitment to a State correctional school, to a State home for the feeble-minded as a feeble-minded person, or to a State hospital as an insane person or as a person addicted to the intemperate use of alcoholic beverages or narcotics or stimulant drugs.[1]

Shotwell studied 12 girls, committed as defective or psychopathic delinquents, average age 18-8 years, average IQ of 94 as measured by the Stanford-Binet, and chronological age range of 15-1 to 23-0 years compared with 12 mentally defective girls, age range 14-9 to 23-11 years, mean age of 18-4 years, and a mean Stanford-Binet IQ of 62.

Shotwell concluded that there were few if any well-defined ways in which the 12 psychopathic delinquents differed from the mentally retarded patients. The most marked differences between the groups seemed to be 1) the higher intelligence rating of the psychopaths, 2) earlier age of first delinquency and longer history of delinquency for psychopaths, 3) the possibility of greater tendency for psychopaths to engage in sex acts with other girls, and 4) the psychopaths were rated slightly above average in qualities of leadership.

---

[1] *Welfare and Institutions Code*, Sacramento, State of California, 1943, cited by Anna M. Shotwell, "A Study of Psychopathic Delinquency," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LI (July, 1946), 220.

On 18 points summarized by Shotwell, it was noted that neither group presented evidence of birth injury or brain damage, and both groups came from broken, unhappy homes; came from homes of low socioeconomic status; had parents who were unstable, immoral, brutal, and irresponsible. Both groups had siblings reported to be delinquent, all had a record of delinquency with sex delinquency reported most frequently. For both groups, ward misconduct tended to be eposodic rather than continuous and foreknowledge of disciplinary measures did not prevent them from misbehaving.

Shotwell did not indicate how her "nonpyschopathic defectives" were selected.

Juvenile Delinquency

Crime may be defined as acts which deviate from or violate some legal norm or statute and which are liable to punishment.[1] Similar acts committed by children within certain age limits are referred to as juvenile delinquency. However, as Rubin[1] points out, juvenile court codes do not confine their definitions of delinquency to violations of law and ordinance. For example, New York State statute defines a delinquent as:

---

[1] Kimball Young, Sociology: A Study of Society and Culture (New York: American Book Co., 1942), pp. 626-32.

> . . . a child (a) who violates any law or any municipal ordinance, or (b) who commits any act which, if committed by an adult would be a crime not punishable by death or life imprisonment, or (c) who is incorrigible or ungovernable or habitually disobedient and beyond the control of his parent, guardian, custodian or other lawful authority, or (d) who is habitually truant, or (e) who, without just cause and without the consent of his parent, guardian, or other custodian, repeatedly deserts his home or place of abode, or (f) who engages in any occupation which is in violation of law, or (g) who associates with immoral or vicious persons, or (h) who frequents any place the existence of which is in violation of law, or (i) who habitually uses obscene or profane language, or who begs or solicits alms or money in public places under any pretense, or (j) who so deports himself as to wilfully injure or endanger the morals or health of himself or others;[2]

Theoretically, a legal definition should establish a separation of delinquent and nondelinquent youth. However, for several reasons the legal definition seems unsatisfactory for educational purposes.

---

[1] Sol Rubin, "The Legal Character of Juvenile Delinquency," The Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Science, No. 261 (January, 1949), p. 2.

[2] McKinney's Consolidated Laws of New York (Annotated), Book 52-A, Social Welfare Law (Brooklyn: Edward Thompson Co., 1941), p. 215.

For example, in outlining acts which constitute delinquency in various state, Rubin[1] calls attention to the fact that most states include eight or nine acts in addition to violations of law. Robison[2] indicates that eight states, on the other hand, do not have legal definitions and allow a judge to determine whether a defendant is a juvenile delinquent or not. Moreover, Robison[3] shows that legal definitions are neither uniform with respect to the kinds of behavior considered delinquent nor in their application. For instance, "ungovernable" behavior, included in the New York State definition, may cover any kind and degree of unsatisfactory relationship between a child and his parent, school, or community.

In addition, several authors note that laws are not uniformly applied and disposition of apprehended offenders is inconsistent between one locality and another. Kephart[4] reports the differential attitude of police toward negroes, and the *U. S. Commission on Civil Rights*[5] discusses alleged police brutality and use of violence in making arrests and to enforce subordination, to punish, and to coerce confessions. Robison[1] also presents evidence which points up the range of "unofficial" measures police may employ in case disposition with apprehended juveniles.

---

[1] Rubin, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

[2] Robison, *op. cit.* pp. 7-9.

[3] *Ibid*.

[4] William M. Kephart, "The Negro Offender: An Urban Research Project," *American Journal of Sociology*, LX, No. 1 (July, 1954), 46-50.

[5] United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Justice*, Report No. 5, 1961 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961).

Of importance, also, is the fact that many juvenile offenders are not apprehended. Examples of undetected or hidden delinquency are illustrated in reports by Porterfield,[2] Murphy, Shirley and Witmer,[3] and Wallerstein and Wyle.[4]

Wolfgang, Savitz and Johnston[5] present a review of the literature on the sociology of crime and delinquency. They illustrate that there is a lack of standardization both in definitions of crimes and in the procedures for collecting and reporting statistics. The probability of being detected in a criminal act, of being apprehended, of being prosecuted, and of being institutionalized are at different levels of statistical probability.[1] Beattie[2] discusses the problems of gathering criminal statistics at the police, court, and prison levels, and Van Vechten[3] illustrates the successive elimination of cases at the various stages of law involvement from apprehension to imprisonment.

---

[1] Robison, op. cit., pp. 207-26.

[2] Austin L. Porterfield, Youth in Trouble (Fort Worth: Leo Potishman Foundation, 1946).

[3] Fred J. Murphy, Mary M. Shirley, and Helen L. Witmer, "The Incidence of Hidden Delinquency," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry (October, 1946), pp. 686-96.

[4] James S. Wallerstein and Clement Wyle, "Our Law-Abiding Lawbreakers," Probation (April, 1947), pp. 107-12.

[5] Marvin E. Wolfgang, Leonard Savitz and Norman Johnston, The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962).

Using 1945 statistics, Ellingston[4] indicates that most crimes in the United States go unsolved and most law violators uncaught.

It is recognized that the actual number of violators remains unknown, and the figures reported deal only with offenses known to the police. According to Ellingston,[5] although law enforcement officials claim that eventually most professional or habitual criminals are apprehended, the evidence suggests that the majority of law violators go unapprehended.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 35-68.

[2] Ronald H. Beattie, "Problems of Criminal Statistics in the United States," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, XLVI (July-August, 1955), 178-86.

[3] Courtlandt C. Van Vechten, "Differential Criminal Case Mortality in Selected Jurisdictions," American Sociological Review, VII (December, 1942), 833-39.

[4] John R. Ellingston, Protecting Our Children from Criminal Careers (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1948), p. 5.

[5] Ibid.

Bell[1] illustrates that illegal gambling, estimated as a twenty-billion-dollar industry by the Kefauver Committee, is one of the largest businesses in the United States. Bell considers crime as an American way of life and states that many distinguished older American fortunes were made through "sharp practices and morally reprehensible methods." Early settlers and those who won the West and built cattle and mining fortunes often did so through "shady speculations" and a considerable amount of violence.

Sutherland[2] has argued that certain practices of business and professional persons should come within the scope of the theories of criminal behavior. These practices are those which have brought about decisions by courts and commissions against the largest industrial and mercantile corporations in the United States under four laws, namely, antitrust, false advertising, National Labor Relations, and infringements of patents, copyrights and trademarks. Another Sutherland[3] paper, concerned with crime in business and the professions, argues to invalidate theories that crime is due to poverty or primarily a lower class phenomenon. In so doing, Sutherland presents evidence which strongly portrays the intentional noncompliance with the dictates of ethical business and professional standards.

---

[1] Daniel Bell, "Crime as an American Way of Life," The Antioch Review, XIII (June, 1953), 131-54.

[2] Edwin H. Sutherland, "Is 'White Collar Crime' Crime?," American Sociological Review, X (1945), 132-39.

[3] Edwin H. Sutherland, "White Collar Criminality," American Sociological Review, V (February, 1940), 1-12.

Barnes and Teeters[1] have expressed the opinion that it is "make-believe" to consider the John Dillingers and Baby-Face Nelsons public-enemies-number-one. They are small operators when compared with the masters of organized gambling, white collar criminals, and corrupt government officials. The prison population and the inmates of juvenile correctional schools and institutions make up a selected fraction of law violators. It has been suggested that this fraction is not the most dangerous but the easiest to apprehend and convict.[2]

Researchers have long felt restricted by the limitations imposed by the lack of uniformity in the legal definition of delinquency. One who studies persons adjudicated by the courts is confronted with the knowledge that he is not studying the "real" delinquent at all

> . . . but an insignificant proportion of non-representative and stupid unfortunates who happen to have become enmeshed in technical legal difficulties.[3]

---

[1] Harry Elmer Barnes and Negley K. Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1943), p. 85.

[2] Ellingston, op. cit., p. 8.

[3] Paul W. Tappan, "Who is the Criminal," American Review, XII (February, 1947), 96.

Tappan[1] defends the contention, nonetheless, that crime, as legally defined, is a significant province of study. His defense, applicable to the area of delinquency, is based on several considerations. He feels that adjudicated delinquents are a sample of law violators, have been carefully selected through due process of law, and represent the closest possible approximation to those who have violated the law. Adjudicated delinquents have been exposed and respond to the influences of court contact, official punitive treatment, and public stigma as delinquents. They offer a varied sample of all types of delinquents, and their origins, traits, and treatment influences may be studied profitably.

Without documentation, Quay[2] indicates that juvenile offenders from lower-class families are more likely to be arraigned and institutionalized for an offense than those from middle- or upper-class families. Nye, Short and Olson[3] present data which show that there is little if any difference in delinquent behavior by socioeconomic level. Short and Nye[1] offer evidence that 50 per cent of all institutionalized boys come from the lowest socioeconomic category while 4 per cent come from the highest status group. This suggests that socioeconomic class plays a major role in whether an offender will be committed to a correctional institution.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Herbert C. Quay, "The Delinquent," Behavioral Research on Exceptional Children, ed. Samuel A. Kirk and Bluma B. Weiner (Washington: Council for Exceptional Children, N.E.A., 1963), pp. 318-56.

[3] F. Ivan Nye, James F. Short, Jr., and Virgil J. Olson, "Socio-Economic Status and Delinquent Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, LXIII (January, 1958), 381-89.

In the same study, Short and Nye show that 24 per cent of most delinquent boys come from broken homes but make up 48 per cent of the institutionalized population. They infer that children from broken homes and from lower socioeconomic groupings are more likely, as a result of the same delinquent behavior, to be institutionalized.

Overstreet,[2] speaking of youth in the general age grouping of 16 to 21, indicates that there is a prevailing tendency to favor institution treatment as a disposition for convicted youthful offenders. His survey of reformitories and institutions reveals a high percentage of young first offenders.

---

[1] James F. Short, Jr. and F. Ivan Nye, "Reported Behavior as a Criterion of Deviant Behavior," Social Problems, V (Winter, 1957), 207-13.

[2] Ben Overstreet, Jr., "A Study of the Youthful Offender," Proceedings: American Correctional Association, 1963 (Washington: The Association, 1963), 245-53.

Whyte[1] and Cohen[2] suggest that the greater part of delinquent behavior is a group phenomenon rather than that of individuals engaged in illegal acts. Cohen and Short[3] describe delinquency as a product of differential group experience within a particular subculture. These same research findings, as well as those reported by Kobrin,[4] point out that the greater number of delinquents are male, are children of lower class parents, and tend to reside in the slums or disadvantaged sections of metropolitan areas.

It is Cohen's[5] notion that there is a delinquent subculture in certain sections of cities which offers status to delinquent boys who are unable to meet middle-class standards. He sees the delinquent subculture as building, maintaining, and reinforcing a code of behavior which exists by opposition and stands in contradiction to the dominant middle class values. Cohen[6] points out that when the delinquent subculture is viewed, it may be seen to be "non-utilitarian," "malicious," and "negativistic."

---

[1] William F. Whyte, Street Corner Society (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1943).

[2] Albert K. Cohen, Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955).

[3] Albert K. Cohen and James F. Short, Jr., "Research in Delinquent Subculture," Journal of Social Issues, XIV (1958).

[4] Solomon Kobrin, "The Conflict of Values in Delinquency Areas," American Sociological Review, XVI (1951), 633-61.

[5] Albert K. Cohen, Delinquent Boys (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955).

[6] Ibid., 24-32.

He finds there is little accounting in rational and utilitarian terms for the effort expended and the danger run in stealing things which are later discarded, destroyed, or given away. He considers delinquent behavior a form of recreation, play, or sport through which the delinquent may achieve recognition while avoiding isolation.

Sykes and Matza[1] do not feel that the delinquent subculture maintains a behavior code or value system which deviates from that set by the dominant society. They find that delinquents in many cases experience a sense of guilt or shame for their behavior and do not view their illegal behavior as morally correct and right. They have also found that many delinquents admire and respect law-abiding persons and do not consider them "immoral" according to a deviant value system.

Matza and Sykes argue that ". . . much delinquency is based on what is essentially an unrecognized extension of defenses to crimes, in the form of justifications for deviance that are seen as valid by the delinquent . . ." but not by society. Sykes and his colleague call the justifications of deviant behavior "techniques of neutralization." They divide the techniques into five major types: (1) the denial of responsibility, (2) the denial of injury, (3) the denial of the victim, (4) the condemnation of the condemners, and (5) the appeal to higher loyalties.

---

[1] Gresham M. Sykes and David Matza, "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency," American Sociological Review, XXII (December, 1957), 664-70.

Cloward and Ohlin[1] think of individuals as being located in two opportunity structures, one legitimate, the other illegitimate. Given limited access to conventional success symbols by legitimate means, the delinquent responds according to the illegitimate means available to him.

They hold that the individual must have access to appropriate environments for the acquisition of the values and skills associated with performance in a particular role, and he must be supported in the performance of that role once he has mastered it. They point out that it takes a long time to make a good criminal, many years of specialized training, and much preparation.[2] They argue that if, in a given social location, illegal means are not readily available, then a delinquent subculture should not be expected to develop among adolescents.

---

[1] Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, "Illegitimate Means and Delinquent Subcultures," Delinquency and Opportunity (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961), pp. 145-52.

[2] Cloward and Ohlin citing Frank Tannenbaum, "The Professional Criminal," The Century, CX (May-October, 1925), 577.

Kobrin[1] discusses the variability of behavior in areas of high delinquency. He notes that in these areas there are not only many boys who engage in delinquent activity without becoming official delinquents, but that there is a substantial number of boys who do possess police and court records who later become conventional and law-abiding citizens. Moreover, there are those without juvenile records who become adult offenders.

Intelligence and Delinquency

In the opening years of this century, many authorities emphasized that the presence of mentally retarded persons in the general community created serious social problems because of their incompetencies, weaknesses, and antisocial behaviors.[2] The feeling prevailing at the time is illustrated in a statement offered by Maennel in a series of lectures delivered at the University of California in 1904:

---

[1] Kobrin, op. cit.

[2] Wallin, op. cit., p. 1.

> Generally, in addition to mental deficiencies there is a social and ethical defect, and perhaps a defect on the side of the emotions. The abnormal child is not only mentally restricted, he is perverse in morals, hostile to society, and either rough and coarse or all too gentle.
>
> He violates the laws of good manners in every possible way, likes to do those things which most children hate, and sometimes gives himself up to those sexual errors which finally influence his health.[1]

Geneologies of the Juke and Kallikak families revealed that many of the intellectually retarded in these groups were law violators and led to the assumption that most criminals were mentally retarded.[2, 3, 4] This belief is emphasized by Goddard in his 1915 analysis of three murders committed by males classified as "criminal imbeciles." Goddard characterized the mentally retarded as "suspicious characters" and "potential criminals" and strongly cautioned that when symptoms of mental retardation are discovered:

---

[1] B. Maennel, _The Auxiliary Schools of Germany_, trans. Fletcher B. Dresslar (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1907), p. 34.

[2] Luella Cole, _Psychology of Adolescence_ (3d ed.; New York: Rinehart and Co., 1948), p. 309.

[3] Stanley P. Davies and Katherine G. Ecob, _The Mentally Retarded in Society_ (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), pp. 33-41.

[4] Wallin, _op. cit._, pp. 43-45, 78-79.

> . . . we must watch and guard such persons as carefully as we do cases of leprosy or any other malignant disease. For fear that someone should feel that these are rare and exceptional cases, let us remind the reader that the best estimate and the result of the most careful studies indicate that somewhere in the neighborhood of 50 per cent of all criminals are feebleminded.[1]

Wallin,[2] after reviewing the studies on the relationship of mental retardation to crime and delinquency, points out that the early application of intelligence measures to apprehended delinquents showed a much higher percentage of low intelligence quotients (IQs) among the delinquent than among the general population. In Wallin's review of studies conducted prior to 1917, the proportion of delinquents classified as "feebleminded" varies from 5 to 93 per cent. As Wallin illustrates, many of these early studies did not report their basis of classification or utilized literal translations and nonstandardized modifications of the Binet-Simon Scale. Often diagnosis of mental retardation was based on a medical or physical examination.

After statistically analyzing the results of 342 studies of the "criminal intelligence" of 175,000 offenders,

---

[1] Henry H. Goddard, The Criminal Imbecile (New York: Macmillan Co., 1915), pp. 105-106.

[2] Wallin, *op. cit.*, pp. 77-104.

Sutherland[1] showed that the estimates of mental retardation among delinquent and criminal groups dropped as intelligence testing techniques improved. Garfield,[2] in commenting on the marked change in findings and point of view toward the retarded and antisocial behavior, states that as better diagnostic and research procedures are utilized, there are fewer sweeping generalizations concerning the inadequacies of the mentally retarded and an increasing awareness of the complexity of the problem.

More recent studies, although not reporting the high percentages found in early reports, continue to show a much higher percentage of low IQs among the delinquent than among a general population. Kvaraceus[3] reported in 1945 that of over 700 delinquents and predelinquents referred for guidance in Passaic, New Jersey, 39.3 per cent had IQs between 70 and 89, 7.6 per cent with IQs between 55 and 69, and 2.8 per cent as "other feebleminded." Merrill,[4] reported in 1947 that 23 per cent of over 1700

---

[1] Edwin H. Sutherland, "Mental Deficiency and Crime," Social Attitudes, ed. Kimball Young (New York: Henry Holt, 1931), pp. 357-75.

[2] Sol L. Garfield, "Abnormal Behavior and Mental Deficiency," Handbook of Mental Deficiency, ed. Norman R. Ellis (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963), pp. 574-601.

[3] William C. Kvaraceus, Juvenile Delinquency and the School (Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Co., 1945).

[4] Maud Amanda Merrill, Problems of Child Delinquency (Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947), pp. 158-80.

Los Angeles court-delinquents had IQs below 70. In another California court sample of 500 cases, she reports 11.6 per cent as mentally retarded.

Durea and Taylor[1] studied 109 boys from the Lancaster, Ohio, Industrial School and found a median Stanford-Binet IQ of 83.9 and a Fullscale Wechsler-Bellevue median of 87.6. Shulman[2] summarized a number of the more recent studies concerned with intelligence and delinquency and showed that dull or mentally retarded delinquents represent a high proportion of delinquency cases.

Goldstein[3] has commented that it is noteworthy that the proportion of mentally retarded in delinquent populations ranges from over two to almost five times the proportion of mentally retarded in the school-age population. To explain discrepancies between studies, he offers four possible factors: a) differences in psychometric instruments, b) differences in criteria of mental retardation, c) differences in concept or definition of delinquency, and d) statutory factors. In explaining statutory factors, it is pointed out that local and state regulations affect prevalence data on mentally retarded youth in delinquency populations. Mentally retarded delinquents may be committed to institutions for the mentally retarded rather than to training or correctional schools. Where this is practiced, it may be assumed that the correctional schools will be relatively free of mentally retarded youth when compared to similar schools in states which do not follow this practice.

---

[1] Mervin A. Durea and G. J. Taylor, "The Mentality of Delinquent Boys Appraised by the Wechsler-Bellevue Intelligence Tests," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LII (April, 1948), 342-44.

[2] Harry M. Shulman, "Intelligence and Delinquency," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XLI, No. 6 (March-April, 1951), 763-81.

[3] Herbert Goldstein, "Social and Occupational Adjustment," Mental Retardation: A Review of Research, ed. Harvey A. Stevens and Rick Heber (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 214-58.

Commitment as a "mentally retarded" person may appear on court records rather than as a "juvenile delinquent" in some of these cases. As Goldstein[1] points out, these practices would tend to reduce the number of mentally retarded youth in the reported delinquent population. He makes no attempt, however, to explain the reason for the consistently higher proportion of mentally retarded in the delinquency statistics.

Although low intelligence and delinquency tend to go together in court statistics, several investigators refute the idea that a causal relationship exists between delinquency and intellectual retardation. Among this group are Clinard,[1] Birnbaum,[2] Ferentz,[3] and Martens.[4] The general feeling of these researchers is stated by Carr:

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 217.

> These statistics are, of course, notoriously skewed in favor of the more comfortable neighborhoods. In other words, the same factors which boost the delinquency rates in certain areas probably also operate to draw the duller and less successful types into those areas and make adjustment more difficult once they are there.[5]

Other researchers have made an attempt to explain the higher proportion of mentally retarded within the delinquent groupings. Metfessel and Lovell[6] have advanced the hypotheses that the difference may be that the mentally retarded are not bright enough to foresee the consequences of their acts or to escape them, that their reduced ability exposes them to more frustrations, and that low intelligence occurs more often in homes which provide low standards and poor patterns of conduct. Johnson[1] has offered a reasonable explanation for the delinquent behavior of slow learners (IQs 75-89) that might be applied to explain the delinquent behavior of the mentally retarded.

---

[1] Marshall B. Clinard, Sociology of Deviant Behavior (New York: Rinehart and Co., 1957), p. 119.

[2] Karl Birnbaum, "A Court Psychiatrist's View of Juvenile Delinquents," Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLXI (January, 1949), 55-63.

[3] Edward J. Ferentz, "Mental Deficiency Related to Crime," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XLV, No. 3 (September-October, 1954), 299-307.

[4] Elise H. Martens, Curriculum Adjustments for the Mentally Retarded (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Bulletin 1954, No. 2) (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950), p. 7.

[5] Lowell Carr, Delinquency Control (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 134.

[6] Milton Metfessel and Constance Lovell, "Recent Literature on Individual Correlates of Crime," Psychological Bulletin, XXXIX (1942), 133-64.

Goldstein[2] observes that most authorities today take a more cautious stand than did Goddard and would state that the exact relationship between mental retardation and delinquent behavior is unknown. Nonetheless, some influence of the early thinking may be found in the literature still. For example, Thompson,[3] referring to the Hartshorne and May[4] studies in deceit which show that as intelligence decreases the frequency of cheating incidences increases, states:

> This relationship is probably determined by at least two psychological factors: (1) the less intelligent children are able to assimilate social values at a slower rate, and (2) the need for cheating is typically greater for the dull children since they have little chance of achieving success by honest means.[5]

---

[1] Johnson, Education for the Slow Learners, pp. 50-57, 308-309.

[2] Goldstein, op. cit., p. 217.

[3] Thompson, op. cit.

[4] Hugh Hartshorne and Mark A. May, Studies in the Nature of Character: I, Studies in Deceit (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1928), p. 571.

[5] Thompson, op. cit.

Thompson's "learn-at-a-slower-rate" factor is consistent with current educational thinking[1] and with Goldstein and Seigle's[2] statement that the intellectual differences that exist between the mentally handicapped and their normal peers:

> . . . are not so much in the kind of characteristics as they are in the rate and degree with which they develop. Educable mentally handicapped children learn in the same way as do normal children, through experience. In contrast, their rate of learning is much slower and they rarely learn as much, particularly in academic areas.

However, one could question Thompson's contention that due to a psychological factor the dull or mentally handicapped possess a need for cheating because they have little chance of achieving success by honest means. Studies by Charles[3] and Kennedy,[4] although showing high percentages of their groups to have violated the law, also show that many of the retarded make adequate social adjustments. This would suggest that at least some retarded persons are able to achieve success by honest means. It seems more likely that the increased incidence in cheating might be attributed to a learned behavior. Goldstein and Seigle have indicated:

---

[1] G. Orville Johnson, "Comparative Studies of Some Learning Characteristics in Mentally Retarded and Normal Children of the Same Mental Age," Syracuse University Research Institute, 1958.

[2] Herbert Goldstein and Dorothy M. Seigle, "Characteristics of Educable Mentally Handicapped Children," Mental Retardation, ed. Jerome H. Rothstein (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962), p. 207.

[3] Don C. Charles, "Ability and Accomplishment of Persons Earlier Judged Mentally Deficient," Genetic Psychology Monographs, XLVII (1953), 3-71.

[4] Ruby J. Kennedy, The Social Adjustment of Morons in a Connecticut City (Hartford, Conn.: Mansfield-Southbury Training Schools Social Service Department, 1948).

> In the course of learning, (the EMR) apply, like other children, the processes of imitation, reasoning, and generalization. To the degree that they can, they acquire concepts and develop value systems consistent with social living.[1]

An even more recent statement by Stevens shows some influence of the earlier thinking that the retarded are unable to adjust outside of an institution or special environment. Stevens states:

> If the mildly retarded are educated in the regular classes, they will present a variety of problems to the regular teacher. Some of these problems are: . . . antisocial behavior . . . and . . . inability to conform to social standards of the class.[2]

Steven's statement appears illogical when related to Johnson's[3] review of the literature comparing the academic and social achievement of retarded in special classes with retarded in regular classes.

---

[1] Goldstein and Seigle, op. cit., p. 207.

[2] Harvey A. Stevens, "Overview," Mental Retardation: A Review of Research, ed. Harvey A. Stevens and Rick Heber (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 5-6.

[3] G. Orville Johnson, "Special Education for the Mentally Handicapped--A Paradox," Exceptional Children, XXIX, No. 2 (October, 1962), 62-69.

Institutions and the EMR Delinquent

Pense's 1943 survey[1] calls attention to various problems faced by the general institution in the care and management of mentally retarded persons who exhibit anti-social, immoral, and delinquent behaviors. He and institution directors report concern with the detrimental influence these patients exert on other patients through their sexual deviations, thefts, and frequent escape attempts. Pense stresses the need for special provisions to handle and manage the mentally retarded delinquent on the basis that they are too delinquent for the general institution and too intellectually retarded for the correctional institution.

More recently, Farrell and his associates[2] at the Fernald State School expressed a similar concern for that group of children who have difficulty adjusting to the demands of institution living and who require attention beyond their proportionate numbers. They stipulate that many of the most severe behavior problems in the institution are those sent to them by the courts as a result of delinquencies rather than low intelligence.

---

[1] Arthur W. Pense, "The Problem of the Male Defective Delinquent in the State School," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, XLVII, No. 4 (April, 1943), 467-72.

[2] Malcolm J. Farrell, John Ogonik, and J. Raymond Pichey, "A Preliminary Study of Behavior Problems in a State School and Therapeutic Plans for Prevention and Rehabilitation," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXII, No. 1 (1957), 26-31.

Chandler, Shafter and Coe[1] indicate that one of the most consistently recurring problems facing institution administrators in both correctional schools and state schools for the mentally retarded has been the management of delinquents with low intelligence. Chandler and his associates point out that the EMR delinquent becomes the "dupe or pawn" of brighter inmates in correctional schools and "perverts" the philosophy of the state school for the mentally retarded.

Davies[2] describes the "defective delinquent" as the most troublesome of all the mentally handicapped. He feels that for the mentally retarded person convicted of law offenses, the usual penal procedures of probation, determinate sentence, and parole do not successfully apply. For those who have committed less serious offenses but whose antisocial tendencies are recognized, commitment to the regular state residential schools are less than adequate.

Concern with the antisocial and immoral behavior of EMR delinquents has resulted in special institutional provisions in several states.[1, 2] As Davies[3] explains, New York in 1921 became the first state to operate a separate facility for defective delinquents when a special institution was established at Napanoch. This institution receives by direct commitment EMR males over 16 years of age who have been convicted of a criminal offense. It also receives, through Department of Correction transfer, individuals who after having been received at correctional institutions are later identified as mentally handicapped.

---

[1] Charles Chandler, Albert Shafter, and Rodney Coe, "Arraignment, Examination, and Confinement of the Mentally Defective Delinquent," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXIII (January, 1959), 723-29.

[2] Stanley P. Davies and Katherine G. Ecob, *The Mentally Retarded in Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), pp. 71-80.

Under existing law, however, New York State Department of Mental Hygiene State Schools for the retarded are unable to transfer patients to Napanoch unless after becoming 16 years of age they are convicted of a new criminal offense while under the authority of the State School.[4]

Of some interest might be a recent statement of the New York State Commission of Correction which indicates that the Eastern Correctional Institution at Napanoch, in Ulster County, previously designated as the Institution for Male Defective Delinquents, now receives "intellectually

---

[1] Malcolm J. Farrell and John Ogonik, "The Present Status of Defective Delinquency in Massachusetts," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LIX, No. 3 (January, 1955), 439-44.

[2] Davies and Ecob, op. cit.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Pense, op. cit.

normal delinquents." At the time of the report, there were 363 normals, more than one-third of the inmate population. The Commission states:

> There is little, if any, discernible difference between inmates in the dull normal group and those in the defective group, except the lower grades of the latter. There is no distinction made between the two in housing, work assignments or other activities. . . . With few exceptions, the inmates are assigned to the regular program which involves a half day in academic or vocational school classes and the other half in vocational training. . . .[1]

New York State institutions for the retarded, and similar institutions in states without special facilities, receive and accumulate EMR adolescents. Few institutions acknowledging concern with the delinquent retardate, however, discuss special programs designed to modify behavior leading toward the rehabilitation of delinquents.

Pense,[2] stating the belief that the institution training of a mentally handicapped person is a "long range program," comments that the policy of the Wassaic State School is to insist that a patient remain in residence for a minimum of one year. Pense, however, does not describe the treatment or rehabilitative content of the program.

---

[1] New York State Commission of Correction, Thirty-Fourth Annual Report (Albany: State Commission of Correction, 1961), p. 19.

[2] Pense, op. cit.

Morris[1] describes a special cottage unit for educable mentally retarded delinquents at Little Plumstead Hospital, Norwich, England. His report, primarily a description of a specially designed facility, does not mention programs or curriculum. Foale[2] investigated through follow-up the effectiveness of training male defective delinquents, but she does not define the program goals or content of the institution from which her sample was graduated.

Williams[3] maintains that institution placement offers mentally retarded delinquents a protective setting in which they can be trained to live by routine, learn how to get along with others, and learn what is and is not acceptable behavior. She states that if a delinquent "remains at an institution long enough," some "stabilization of his personality" will take place. This accomplishment, Williams feels, is effected "particularly when an understanding attendant or social worker" exerts influence upon the delinquent. Techniques, methods, or approaches used by the institution staff are not discussed.

---

[1] J. V. Morris, "A Special Unit for Delinquent Defectives," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXII (1957), 432-35.

[2] Martha Foale, "An Approach to Stabilization of Male Juvenile Mental Defective Delinquents," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LVII (July, 1952), 116-22.

[3] Ruth Williams, "Casework With Defective Delinquents," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXI (October, 1956), 413-18.

Sternlight[1] reports a technique by which one may gain an initial relationship in group psychotherapy with delinquent retarded adolescent males. His technique consists of engaging in an Indian hand-wrestling match with the strongest boy in a therapy group to demonstrate the therapist's physical superiority and authority in a concrete manner. This sort of approach, Sternlight indicates, is one which "delinquent patients can comprehend and appreciate."

Farrell, Ogonik and Pichey,[2] after making a preliminary study of behavior problems at the Fernald State School, report plans to initiate a rehabilitation program which is to involve the entire staff of the institution. The program is reported to be based on the "therapeutic community" ideas of Jones.[3] Farrell and his associates, considering the program "too young" to measure successes or failures, did not feel ready to discuss outcomes of the program. They did indicate that their study had served to stimulate discussion among their staff which made them all aware of the lack of a program for children with behavior problems.

---

[1] Manny Sternlight, "Establishing an Initial Relationship in Group Psychotherapy with Delinquent Retarded Male Adolescents," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXIX, No. 1 (July, 1964), 39-41.

[2] Farrell, Ogonik, and Pichey, *op. cit.*

[3] Maxwell Jones, *Therapeutic Community: A New Treatment Method in Psychiatry* (New York: Basic Books, 1953).

New York State Institutions

In New York State, the Department of Mental Hygiene has a general administrative responsibility for the state institutions for the mentally retarded.[1] These are Newark State School, Letchworth Village, Rome State School, Syracuse State School, Wassaic State School, and Willowbrook State School.

According the Pense, Patton and Hills,[2] the percentage of mildly retarded varies from 19 per cent at Willowbrook State School to 37 per cent at Rome. The percentages of children under 15 years of age vary from 12 per cent at Wassaic to 55 per cent at Willowbrook State School. This imbalance in populations is attributed to factors such as transfers to newly-established institutions from older institutions, admission restrictions related to availability of facilities for certain patient-types, and that an older institution generally has an older age group. "With the exception of the Syracuse State School, the institutions in the department admit on a regional basis and theoretically should have the same general composition of patients by chronological age and mental level."[1]

---

[1] Arthur W. Pense, Robert Patton, and Granville Hills, "The Use of Sampling Techniques to Determine the Extent of Patients' Physical Care Needs in Several Institutions," _American Journal of Mental Deficiency_, LXVII, No. 2 (September, 1962) 211-17.

[2] _Ibid_.

The Rome and Syracuse State Schools were selected by this investigator as representative of New York State public institutions for the mentally retarded. As will be shown, Syracuse State School is unique in that it accepts only educable mentally retarded (EMR) youth. It is the oldest public institution in the state.

Rome State School, on the other hand, is a general institution receiving all types of patients and degrees of mental retardation. Its population of educable mentally retarded, however, is highest of other general institutions in New York State. It is the second oldest public institution for the mentally retarded in the state.

It was felt that an adequate study sample, representative of New York State educable mentally retarded, delinquent, adolescent boys, could be obtained from these two institutionalized populations.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 211.

A brief description of the history, population, and training program of these two institutions follows.

Syracuse State School. In July 1848, a private school for the education of the mentally retarded was established in Barre, Massachusetts, by Dr. Hervey Backus Wilbur.[1] Wilbur is held to be the first physician in the United States to establish such a program.

In 1845, a bill, proposing that the state undertake the care and teaching of retarded persons, was introduced to the New York State legislature by state Senator Frederick F. Backus. Under provisions established by this bill, adopted by the legislature in 1851, The New York State Asylum for Idiots was opened on an experimental basis in October 1851 in a rented, private residence near Albany, New York. Dr. Wilbur was appointed the superintendent of this experimental school.

Considering the experimental school a success, the New York State legislature in 1853 passed a bill appropriating funds to purchase land and erect a special institution for the mentally retarded.

---

[1] Information included in this section paraphrased from: State of New York, One Hundredth Annual Report of Syracuse State School to the Department of Mental Hygiene (Utica, N.Y.: State Hospitals Press, March, 1950) unless noted.

Various sites were considered, among them an 18-acre tract of land in Syracuse, New York, offered free of charge by a group of Syracuse citizens. The Syracuse site was accepted, the cornerstone laid on September 8, 1854, and the first building completed and occupied on August 10, 1855.

It is held that this was the first building in the United States built to care for mentally defective children and maintained at public expense. Dr. Wilbur remained as the superintendent of the school until his death in 1883.

In 1867 a branch of the Syracuse Asylum was established for female patients who could not profit from an academic curriculum. This led to the establishment of the Newark Custodial Asylum for Feebleminded Females.

In 1883 a farm was purchased at Fairmount, about five miles from Syracuse, where older boys were taught farming and raised crops which were consumed at the school.

In 1886 a separate custodial facility for the care of "unteachable" boys was recommended. This led to the development of Rome State School in 1894. A separate institution for epileptics was recommended in 1889 which led to the establishment of Craig Colony.

In 1891 the name of the school was changed to Syracuse State Institution for Feebleminded Children and in 1926 to its present title, Syracuse State School.

The school has continued to occupy the site selected in 1854 and utilizes the original buildings constructed at that time.

The 1960 Directory of the American Association on Mental Deficiency describes the Syracuse State School and Hospital facility.[1] This report indicates that in residence are 398 boys and 338 girls. This report indicates that admission is limited to "educable mentally retarded between the ages of 7 and 15 years with IQ from 50-70." Once accepted as a resident, "students may remain beyond the age limit."

The institution has a total of 402 full-time employees, 27 teachers, 2 psychologists, 9 nurses, 6 resident physicians, 1 resident dentist, 7 social workers, 1 business manager, 2 dietitians, and several visiting physician-consultants.

---

[1] American Association on Mental Deficiency, Listings of State and Private Training Schools and Homes for the Retarded, Directory of the American Association on Mental Deficiency, Appendix A (Willimantic, Conn.: The Association, 1960), p. 86.

There are 18 two-story buildings housing students.

At the time of this investigation, Dr. Jacob Schneider was the Director.

Syracuse State School Training Program. In a 1950 report,[1] the Syracuse State School is described as a training school for "teachable morons of both sexes." Its objective is to give children as much academic work as they are able "to absorb" followed with training in domestic arts and farm work. The ultimate objective is that children will be discharged to their respective communities able to obtain gainful employment and become self-supporting. "The academic program at the institution has for its aim not only the improvement of a child's scholastic standing but eventually his success in social adjustment."[2]

In addition to the academic subjects, physical training, religious education, and some social events are part of the school program. There are some gymnasium activities every day and games outdoors after school. The school sponsors an active Boy Scout troop.

---

[1] _One Hundredth Annual Report of Syracuse State School_, pp. 12-14.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 12.

Dances are held once a week, 16 mm films are shown at frequent intervals, and parties are held on special occasions.

Physical and recreational activities are provided "to develop body control and alertness." "Social benefits are important and the qualities of good sportsmanship, loyalty, cooperation and a sense of responsibility are acquired" by the patients.[1]

Rome State School. In 1896, the board of trustees of the Syracuse "Asylum for Idiots" recommended that a separate custodial institution for the care of "unteachable" boys be established.[2] This recommendation led to the development of Rome State School, first occupied in 1894. Davies[3] explains that the need for custodial care of patients, "especially for low-grade and delinquent cases," led to the establishment of the "Rome State Custodial Asylum."

The 1960 Directory of the American Association on

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 10.

[3] Davies and Ecob, op. cit., p. 24.

Mental Deficiency describes the facility.[1] This report indicates that no restrictions are made on the types of patients accepted, and that there are 2810 males and 2271 females in residence. The institution has 1294 full-time employees, 20 teachers, 2 psychologists, 28 registered nurses, 11 practical nurses, 12 resident physicians, 3 resident dentists, 18 social workers, 1 business manager, and 1 dietitian.

At the time of this investigation, Charles Greenberg, M.D., was the director.

Training Program. In discussing the Rome State School academic program, Peters[1] notes that ". . . the combined influence of all the stimuli and responses acting upon the life of the mentally deficient . . . determines his character and personality." The purpose of the Rome State School is to train children toward socially accepted standards to the point where they may be returned to the community with a reasonable expectation of successful adjustment. Peters states:

---

[1] American Association on Mental Deficiency, *Listings of State and Private Training Schools and Homes for the Retarded*, Directory of the American Association on Mental Deficiency, Appendix A (Willimantic, Conn.: The Association, 1960), p. 86.

[2] Roswell B. Peters, "The Role of the Institution Academic School in the Rehabilitation of the Mentally Retarded," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXIII, No. 3 (November, 1958), 506-10.

> It is the purpose of all phases of training . . . to plan . . . programs with as much care as is used in a formal classroom. . . . The academic, the industrial, the recreational, the therapy, the social service and the ward service have their particular role to play in the development of those qualities in the individual which make up this total character. . . . The staff and personnel in the Rome State School are conscious of this responsibility and are working toward a successful rehabilitation of the patient.[1]

In an earlier article, Peters[2] stated that the general program of education at the Rome State School was both scholastic and vocational. In outlining the program, academic work is expanded to include material that the normal or average child learns "incidentally from association and contact." The basis for course content is said to be determined by what children need to adjust satisfactorily to community life when paroled or discharged.

Although not defined, Peters notes that "irrelevant and so called developmental topics and subjects have been combed from the syllabi and curricula of the traditional school." All subject matter not directly related to the life of children at the institution, is eliminated from that usually given in the public school.

Patients are enrolled in industrial arts courses to provide a pastime to "relieve the monotony of institution life."

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 506.

[2] Roswell B. Peters, "The Education Program in the Rome State School," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LI (1946), 280-85.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

This chapter describes the subjects selected for study and the instrumentation utilized to test them. Described are the criteria, rationale, and procedure for the selection of subjects and the comparison made of discrete groupings in terms of chronological age, time-in-residence, and intelligence test scores.

Subjects

Criteria and Procedure for Selection

The general plan of this investigation required the identification of a group of institutionalized male, lower-class adolescents who were intellectually retarded and delinquent. Subjects selected were equated as nearly as possible on the basis of chronological age, intelligence test scores, participation in delinquent activities prior to commitment, social class status, and etiological classification.

All major medical, psychological, legal, social service, and educational records were made available to the investigator by the Directors[1] of the Rome and Syracuse State Schools.

Briefly stated, the selection criteria included:

Chronological Age (CA). Subjects selected ranged from the ages of 144 months (12-0 years) through 198 months (16-6 years).

This investigator felt that subjects within this age grouping should be concerned with their own value-beliefs. Although this expectation has not been established for educable mentally retarded adolescents, Kuhlen, in speaking of adolescents in general, states:

> In the first place, being on the threshold of adulthood and beginning to make his own decisions and choices, he must consider his own values and reasons rather than merely accepting those provided ready-made by parents. Under such circumstances he will likely examine more carefully than before the beliefs that he holds. Second, he is probably finding that the precepts and maxims of conduct taught in his home (and which may have been adequate and consistent within a relatively limited environment) are not consistent with the beliefs held by those from different backgrounds with whom he is now in close contact. As other standards are encountered, old ones must be reexamined, and new or revised guide-posts may emerge, or old ones be reaffirmed.[2]

---

[1] At the time of this investigation, Charles Greenberg, M.D., was Director of the Rome State School, and Jacob Schneider, M.D., was Director of the Syracuse State School.

[2] Raymond Kuhlen, The Psychology of Adolescent Development (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), p. 399.

Because the subjects selected were experiencing an institution setting after having lived nine or more years in the relatively free setting of their home communities, this investigator expected the impact of confinement to effect some degree of self-evaluation of their value-beliefs. If nothing else, it was felt this age grouping would be interested and motivated toward answering the questions presented in the testing situation.

Goldstein[1] reports the median ages of various classificatory types at time of first admission to state residential schools for the mentally retarded for the years 1939 to 1952. For the intellectual grouping (IQs 50 to 79) selected for the present investigation, the median age of first admissions range between 13.4 years and 15.8 years over the 16 years searched by Goldstein. The age grouping selected for this investigation was consistent with Goldstein's findings.

Intelligence. Intelligence test scores, expressed as intelligence quotients (IQs), ranged from 50 through 79 as measured by an individually administered intelligence test.

---

[1] Herbert Goldstein, "Population Trends in U.S. Public Institutions for the Mentally Deficient," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXIII, No. 4 (January, 1959), 599-604.

Subjects with IQs within the 50 to 79 range were considered by this investigator to be the most educable of the institution population and considered to have the potential for making an adequate social adjustment. It seemed to this investigator that within this intellectual grouping were the individuals the institution would plan to return eventually to the community.

Reason for Commitment. Subjects selected were either adjudicated delinquent by a New York State Court or described in the commitment reports as having manifested delinquent behaviors described in the New York State Social Welfare Law, Volume II, Article 6, Section 371.[1]

To differentiate between delinquent behavior and behavior attributed to neurotic disturbances or behavior associated with brain-injury, epilepsy, or other primary physical injury or disease, the following principles applied:

1. Delinquency was thought of as norm-violating behavior or social behavior in violation of law whether it resulted in arrest by police authorities or not.

---

[1] McKinney's Consolidated Laws of New York.

2. Excluded from selection were subjects diagnosed by the Rome State School and Syracuse State School medical staff as neurotic, psychotic, schizophrenic, manic-depressive, epileptic, and/or organic brain-injured or brain-damaged.

Subjects selected were those who prior to commitment manifested behavior described by Bennett[1] to differentiate delinquent from neurotic subjects.

These principles served to incorporate or blend the "legal concept" and "community meaning" of delinquency noted by Redl and Wineman[2] while suspending the Redl-Wineman "clinical concept." These principles served, also, to exclude from study those EMR persons considered by this investigator better served by the medical disciplines.

Socioeconomic Status. While it was not possible to control subjects for exact socioeconomic status, subjects were selected on the basis of family income, source of income, father's occupation, father's education, and the description of house and neighborhood as reported in the social service records.

Social service case-study records were searched to obtain data on the socioeconomic status of the subjects' families. This was executed to equate all subjects on social class. The Warner, Meeker and Eells[1] Index of Status Characteristics served to guide this search and was applied to these data.

---

[1] Ivy Bennett, Delinquency and Neurotic Children (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960), pp. 63-80.

[2] Fritz Redl and David Wineman, The Agressive Child (Glencoe: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1957), pp. 142-43.

Warner's Index assigns a rating of from 1 to 7 on each of four status characteristics: Occupation, Source of Income, House Type, and Dwelling Area.

Each of these characteristics is assigned a numerical weight to be multiplied by the rating. These four products are totaled to secure a weighted total which may be any number from 12 to 84 inclusive. Weighted total ratings between 54 and 84 are assigned lower social-class placements. Where data for any of the four ratings were not available, proper weights for the other three ratings were applied as instructed by Warner.[2]

Subjects with lower-class placement scores were selected for this investigation.

Etiological Classification. Subjects selected were classified by the institutions' medical staff as

---

[1] W. Lloyd Warner, Marchia Meeker, and Kenneth Eells, Social Class in America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960).

[2] Ibid., p. 124.

Familial, Cultural-familial, or Undifferentiated.[1, 2]

The present system of clinical classification of mentally retarded persons within institutions under the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene is in accordance with and based on published references.

One reference[3] notes that a diagnosis of mental deficiency requires "in every case a careful study" to "determine causes, degree of defect and accompanying physical and emotional disorders." The study and survey includes a complete history and examination of the child to include a psychometric examination. Considered of much value, the psychometric examination, however, is not used as the sole criterion of mental defect but is interpreted in accordance with other findings.

The clinical classification "Familial" includes those cases in which mental deficiency in the family appears to have a direct relation to the mental deficient state of the patient.[4] The history of the immediate family of the patient with respect to mental deficiency is

---

[1] Rick Heber, "A Manual on Terminology and Classification in Mental Retardation," Monograph Supplement, American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXIV, No. 2 (September, 1959).

[2] Committee on Statistics, American Association on Mental Deficiency, Statistical Manual for the Use of Institutions for Mental Defectives (Utica, N. Y.: State Hospital Press, 1941).

[3] Ibid., p. 15. [4] Ibid., p. 15.

reported in the patient's medical records and the number of sisters, brothers, and children found defective are specified.[1]

The condition of mental deficiency, or the diagnostic mental status, is determined by a combined consideration of all clinical data relating to the patient.[2] Examples of other clinical classifications based on these data include: "mongolism," mental deficiency "due to trauma after birth," mental deficiency "due to trauma during birth," "due to infection," "with developmental cranial anomaly," and other classifications.

Persons classified as "Undifferentiated" are those mentally defective individuals who cannot be placed under any clinical type and are not differentiated either by symptomatology, pathogenisis, or cause.[3]

A more recent source of medical classification, also used by the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene institutions, provides eight general groupings with from two to ten subgroupings within each category.[4] Within "Category VIII: Mental Retardation Due to Uncertain

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 19. [2] _Ibid_., p. 18. [3] _Ibid_.

[4] Heber, _American Journal of Mental Deficiency_, LXIV, No. 2.

(or Presumed Psychologic) Cause With the Functional Reaction Alone Manifest" are the two with which the present investigation was concerned.[1]

The general category is used for the classification of those whose condition of mental retardation occurs "in absence of any clinical or historical indication of organic disease or pathology which could reasonably account for the retarded intellectual functioning."[2] It is noted that no person is to be classified in this division except after an exhaustive medical evaluation.[3]

The classification "Cultural-familial" mental retardation requires that there be evidence of retardation in intellectual functioning in at least one of the patient's parents and in one or more sibling, where there are such, in addition to absence of reasonable indication of cerebral pathology.[4]

"Mental Retardation, Other, Due to Uncertain Cause" is the classification for those cases of mental retardation where there is no evidence of a physical cause or structural defect, no history of mental retardation in the family, and no evidence of an associated psychogenic or psychosocial factor.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid*., pp. 12, 16-17, 39-41.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 39. [3] *Ibid*. [4] *Ibid*.

Subjects selected by this investigator were classified by the institutions' medical staff as:

(1) a. Familial, b. Cultural-familial, or

(2) a. Undifferentiated, b. Mental Retardation, Other, Due to Uncertain Cause With the Functional Reaction Alone Manifest.

Race. No control was made on the basis of race; however, white subjects only were selected from the Rome State School population, while both negro and white subjects were selected from the Syracuse State School population. No oriental subjects were found in the populations-survey of either institution.

Sex. All subjects selected were male. Adjudicated delinquents are predominantly male with the ratio of apprehended boys to girls reported as approximately 5 to 1.[2] In view of this sex difference in recorded delinquency, it seemed that males constitute the greater problem.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 40-41.

[2] Robison, op. cit., 32-33.

Age-at-Admission. Subjects selected from the Rome State School population were those admitted to the institution after reaching 144 months (12-0 years) of age but before reaching 192 months (16-0 years) of age. Subjects admitted prior to the twelfth anniversary of their birth date or after the sixteenth anniversary were excluded.

Subjects selected from the Syracuse State School were those admitted after reaching 108 months (9-0 years) of age but before reaching 192 months (16-0 years) of age. Subjects admitted prior to the ninth anniversary of their birth date of after the sixteenth anniversary were excluded.

Time-in-Residence. In order to isolate the variable of institution living it was necessary to equate all subjects in such a manner that the major difference between them was length of stay at the institution. All subjects meeting selection criteria admitted to the Rome State School on a date four years previous to the record search were considered potential subjects. All subjects meeting selection criteria admitted to the Syracuse State School five years previous to the record search were considered potential subjects.

Parole, home-visit, and field trip reports were scrutinized and potential subjects with over 30 days on home-visit or parole within 6 months of testing were excluded. This control did not hold for subjects placed within the 6 month period prior to testing.

Potential subjects on home-visit two weeks prior to testing were excluded. Subjects on home-visit, Community Status, Leave, or Absent Without Consent were excluded. Included, however, were subjects in disciplinary wards, hospital wards, and farm colonies.

Summary Selection Criteria

Within the total retarded population, 70 to 85 per cent show no demonstrable gross abnormality of the brain and generally are persons with relatively mild degrees of retardation.[1] In general, the prevalence of this group is greater within the lower socioeconomic groupings of society.[2]

---

[1] Alfred A. Strauss and Laura E. Lehtinen, *Psychopathology and Education of the Brain-Injured Child* (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1947), p. 15.

[2] Seymour Sarason and Thomas Gladwin, *Psychological Problems in Mental Deficiency* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), pp. 421-23, 471-87.

Much of the research on juvenile delinquency suggests that delinquency rates are highest in these same lower socioeconomic groupings, especially those residing in the deteriorated areas of the larger cities.[1] The National Institute of Mental Health, reporting jointly with the Children's Bureau, states:

> . . . in residence in such areas are those who have drifted there because of failure to compete successfully for more desirable living space (whether because of lack of skills, disease, or other disability) and persons who have located in them because of a desire for freedom from conventional restraints. These neighborhoods are characterized not only by physical deterioration, but by a very great heterogeneity of background and moral standards. . . .[2]

It was felt by this investigator that by controlling socioeconomic status, the grouping of subjects selected would hold somewhat similar economic and cultural backgrounds. This similarity of home and family background would control the institutions' discharge-to-home considerations and influence its treatment orientation with similar emphasis for the subjects selected.

Because this investigation was concerned with subjects interacting in a structured environment, as exemplified by an institution for the mentally retarded, and designed to seek information concerning the effect of that environment on value-beliefs, previous environmental climates and pressures were regarded to have been relatively similar for all subjects on the basis of similarity of socioeconomic status.

---

[1] Report to the Congress on Juvenile Delinquency, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960).

[2] Ibid., p. 5.

Whatever differences might have been present in the previous environmental press were considered of minimum consequence to the purpose of this investigation.

The intent was to obtain a homogeneous group of patients that could be characterized as educable mentally retarded, lower-class, delinquent, adolescent males of Familial, Cultural-Familial, or Undifferentiated etiology living within an institution setting.

Design

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of institution living on certain value-beliefs professed by selected educable mentally retarded subjects. Subjects meeting selection criteria were assigned to "time-in-residence" groups determined by their length of stay at the institution. Time-in-Residence (TIR) was expressed in months.

TIR was determined by subtracting the testing date from the admission date for each subject. This was checked by subtracting age-at-admission (AAA) from age-at-testing (AAT) expressed in months. TIR groupings were established arbitrarily at 12 month time increments. The design considered appropriate to this investigation is illustrated in Figure 1.

Group	1	2	3	4	5
TIR (months)	1-12	13-24	25-36	37-48	49-60
RSS Ss					None
SSS Ss					
Total Ss					

Fig. 1. Design of TIR grouping assignments.

Selection Procedure

The academic school register of male patients at the Rome State School, Rome, New York, was obtained. It included over 300 potential subjects from which to draw a study population. A listing of approximately 175 male patients meeting chronological age (CA) criteria was compiled.

Similarly, the register of male patients at the Syracuse State School, Syracuse, New York, was obtained. It included over 350 potential subjects. A listing of 110 male patients meeting CA criteria was compiled.

Individual case study files, consisting of legal and medical reports, social service case-study summaries, and psychological work-up records were inspected at the Rome and Syracuse State Schools. This inspection was undertaken to determine 1) behavior factors associated with institution placement, 2) clinical and medical diagnoses, 3) intelligence test results, and 4) family background information.

A total of 34 white subjects at Rome State School and 42 negro and white subjects at Syracuse State School meeting selection criteria were identified. Of the Rome State School group of 34 subjects, 10 were excluded prior to testing due to official summer leaves of absence, 7 were excluded due to age factors at the time of testing, and 1 was excluded because of erratic behavior during the testing session. The results of testing are reported for the 16 subjects designated as RSS.

Of the 42 subjects identified and tested at the Syracuse State School, none was excluded. The results of testing are reported for the 42 subjects and are designated SSS. Within the SSS group, 20 are white and designated SSS-A; 22 are Negro and are designated SSS-B.

For analysis an additional grouping was formed on the basis of white race. The 20 white subjects from the Syracuse State School and the 16 white subjects from the Rome State School were combined as 36 subjects and are designated WHITE.

The results of testing are reported for the combined SSS and RSS sample of 58 subjects and are designated Total Sample.

Description of the Groups

Complete data concerning CA, IQ, time in residence (TIR), age at admission, race, and etiological classification are found in Appendix A. Means, standard deviations, and ranges on CA, TIR, and IQ are presented in Tables 1 through 3 for the Total Sample and groups established on institution of residence and race.

Chronological Age (CA)

Table 1 shows the status of the Total Sample and the 5 sub-groupings on CA. the range of CAs for the RSS group was from 162 months through 198 months. The mean CA was 181.94 months with a standard deviation of 11.45.

The CAs for the SSS ranged from 145 months through 197 months. The mean CA was 170.69 with a standard deviation of 14.76.

The CAs for the SSS-A group ranged from 145 months through 197 months. The mean CA was 174.35 months with a standard deviation of 14.71.

The range of CAs for the SSS-B group was from 146 months through 192 months. The mean CA was 167.36 months

TABLE 1

STATUS OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND FIVE GROUPINGS ON CHRONOLOGICAL AGE

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	SD (months)	Range		F	*t*
RSS	16	181.94	11.45	162-198	RSS/SSS	7.53^{**}	2.74^{**}
SSS	42	170.69	14.76	145-197	RSS/SSS-A	2.86	1.69
(SSS-A)	(20)	174.35	14.71	145-197	RSS/SSS-B	11.28^{**}	3.36^{**}
(SSS-B)	(22)	167.36	14.33	146-192	SSS-A/SSS-B	2.43	1.56
(White)	(36)	177.72	13.72	145-198	SSS-B/White	7.53^{**}	2.74^{**}
Total Sample	58	173.79	14.73	145-198			

$^{**}p < .01$, two-tailed test.

RSS = Rome State School
SSS = Syracuse State School
SSS-A = Syracuse State School White
SSS-B = Syracuse State School Negro
White = Syracuse and Rome State School White

with a standard deviation of 14.33.

The CAs for the WHITE group were from 145 months through 198 months with a mean CA of 177.72 months and a standard deviation 13.72.

The CAs for the Total Sample ranged from 145 months through 198 months with a mean CA of 173.79 months and a standard deviation of 14.73.

A comparison of the CAs and the significance of differences in the mean CAs of the groups are also summarized in Table 1. A one-way analysis of variance produced significant F values for three comparisons.

Extracting the square root of the F value produced significant t's on the CA variable for the same three comparisons. A CA difference was expected for the Syracuse and Rome State School samples as selection criterion was slightly different when samples were taken. Subjects selected from the Rome State School were those admitted after reaching 144 months of age while those taken from the Syracuse State School were those admitted after reaching 108 months of age.

The significant CA difference, however, between the Negro and combined white groups within the Total Sample was unexpected. CA differences between Negro and white delinquents, nonetheless, have been previously noted by Axelrad.[1] A study of 300 New York City institutionalized delinquent males found that compared to white delinquents, Negro youth are committed younger, for less serious offenses, and with fewer court appearances.

Time-in-Residence (TIR)

Table 2 shows the status of Total Sample and the 5 sub-groupings on TIR. The range of TIR for the RSS group was from 2 months through 40 months. The mean TIR was 15.38 months with a standard deviation of 11.02.

The TIR for the SSS group ranged from 1 month through 60 months with a mean TIR of 25.33 months and a standard deviation of 18.68.

The TIR for the SSS-A group ranged from 3 months through 60 months with a mean TIR of 31.50 and a standard deviation of 18.99.

The range of TIR for the SSS-B group was from 1

---

[1] S. Axelrad, "Negro and White Male Institutionalized Delinquents," _American Journal of Sociology_, LVII (1952), 569-74.

TABLE 2

STATUS OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND FIVE GROUPINGS ON TIME-IN-RESIDENCE

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	SD (months)	Range		F	t
RSS	16	15.38	11.02	2-40	RSS/SSS	3.99	2.00
SSS	42	25.33	18.68	1-60	RSS/SSS-A	9.06**	3.01**
(SSS-A)	(20)	31.50	18.99	3-60	RSS/SSS-B	.81	.90
(SSS-B)	(22)	19.73	16.90	1-52	SSS-A/SSS-B	4.52*	2.13*
(White)	(36)	24.33	17.72	2-60	SSS-B/White	.96	.98
Total Sample	58	22.59	17.41	1-60			

*$p < .05$, two-tailed test
**$p < .01$, two-tailed test

RSS = Rome State School
SSS = Syracuse State School
SSS-A = Syracuse State School White
SSS-B = Syracuse State School Negro
White = Syracuse and Rome State School White

month through 52 months. The mean TIR was 19.73 months with a standard deviation of 16.90.

The TIR for the WHITE group ranged from 2 months through 60 months with a mean TIR of 24.33 and a standard deviation of 17.72.

TIR for the Total Sample ranged from 1 month through 60 months with a mean TIR of 22.59 months and a standard deviation of 17.41.

Results of the simple one-way analysis of variance undertaken for the variable TIR for the groups are shown in Table 2. The significant difference between the Rome and Syracuse State School white grouping is recognized as due to selection criterion difference at the time of sample identification. RSS subjects were selected from a four year admission period while SSS-A subjects were selected from a five year admission period. 5

The TIR difference between white and Negro subjects at the Syracuse State School was not expected. A review of the literature did not reveal an explanation for the shorter length of stay for Negro subjects.

Intelligence Quotient (IQ)

Intelligence test scores as measured by an individually administered intelligence scale are expressed in IQs. Table 3 shows the status of the Total Sample and 5 sub-groupings on IQ. In most cases both a *Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale* and a *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children* have been administered by the institution's psychological staff. In all cases, the latest test results were obtained and are reported.

The range of IQs for the RSS group was from 59 through 78. The mean IQ was 67.06 with a standard deviation of 6.49.

The IQs for the SSS group ranged from 50 through 77 with a mean IQ of 66.95 and a standard deviation of 6.10.

The IQs for the SSS-A group ranged from 50 through 73 with a mean IQ of 64.80 and a standard deviation of 5.59.

For the SSS-B group, the range of IQs was from 54 through 77 with a mean IQ of 68.90 and a standard deviation of 5.99.

TABLE 3

STATUS OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND FIVE GROUPINGS ON INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Range		F	t
RSS	16	67.06	6.49	59-78	RSS/SSS	.004	.06
SSS	42	66.95	6.10	50-77	RSS/SSS-A	1.26	1.12
(SSS-A)	(20)	64.80	5.59	50-73	RSS/SSS-B	.82	.91
(SSS-B)	(22)	68.90	5.99	54-77	SSS-A/SSS-B	5.25*	2.29*
(White)	(36)	65.81	6.02	50-78	SSS-B/White	3.64	1.91
Total Sample	58	66.98	6.15	50-78			

*$p < .05$, two-tailed test.

RSS = Rome State School
SSS = Syracuse State School
SSS-A = Syracuse State School White
SSS-B = Syracuse State School Negro
White = Syracuse and Rome State School White

The range of IQs for the WHITE group was from 50 through 78 with a mean of 65.81 and a standard deviation of 6.02.

The range of IQs for the Total Sample was from 50 through 78 with a mean of 66.98 and a standard deviation of 6.15.

A simple one way analysis of variance for IQ was computed for group comparison. Table 3 depicts the results of this analysis. Indicated is a significant difference in the IQs of the Syracuse State School Negroes when compared with the Syracuse State School white subjects.

Summary

Significant differences between Rome and Syracuse State School subjects on CA and TIR may be explained as due to selection criteria differences. Significant differences between Negro and white subjects on CA have been noted by previous investigations.

Significant differences between Negro and white subjects on TIR and intelligence test scores are not easily explained.

Description of Sub-Groups Within the Total Sample

Sub-groupings within the Total Sample were formed in view of questions in reference to possible differences attributed to CA, TIR, race, and institutional climate. Previously described were the groupings formed on the basis of institution of residence and race. In addition, 5 sub-groupings were established on CA and 5 sub-groupings were formed on TIR.

Information on the sub-groups formed on the basis of TIR and CA is shown in Table 4.

Chronological Age Sub-groups

For the Total Sample, CAs ranged from 145 months through 198 months with a mean CA of 173.79 months and a standard deviation of 14.73. Five sub-groupings established on CA were formed from the Total Sample. All 12 year old subjects were assigned to a sub-group designated CA-12; 13 year old subjects were assigned to a sub-group designated CA-13; all 14 year old subjects were assigned to a sub-group designated CA-14; all 15 year old subjects were

TABLE 4

STATUS OF TEN SUB-GROUPINGS ON CHRONOLOGICAL AGE, TIME-IN-RESIDENCE, AND INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT

Group	N	Chronological Age (Months)			Time-in-Residence (Months)			Intelligence Quotient		
		$\overline{X}$	SD	Range	$\overline{X}$	SD	Range	$\overline{X}$	SD	Range
CA-12	9	149.89	3.89	145-155	12.56	11.77	3-38	68.67	5.36	61-73
CA-13	11	163.00	3.19	156-167	19.09	21.52	1-55	65.18	4.85	55-70
CA-14	16	174.00	3.71	168-179	22.13	20.92	2-60	65.63	6.14	54-77
CA-15	15	186.07	3.28	180-191	29.07	12.16	8-48	69.13	5.60	63-78
CA-16	7	194.71	2.63	192-198	28.14	12.97	7-40	66.14	9.30	50-77
TIR-1	26	166.31	13.18	145-196	6.65	3.59	1-12	65.65	6.53	54-78
TIR-2	7	181.00	12.50	159-196	18.43	2.51	15-22	69.43	6.27	62-77
TIR-3	8	179.75	15.29	146-192	28.38	1.77	26-31	70.00	4.00	66-76
TIR-4	12	183.50	13.61	148-197	42.83	3.81	37-48	65.92	6.93	50-76
TIR-5	5	169.80	4.97	166-177	53.40	4.28	49-60	68.20	2.78	65-72

assigned to a sub-group designated CA-15; and all 16 year old subjects were assigned to a sub-group designated CA-16.

CA-12 Group. For the CA-12 group, CAs ranged from 145 months through 155 months and comprised the youngest group for which results of testing are reported. The mean CA for this group was 149.89 with a standard deviation of 3.89. The range of TIR for the CA-12 group was from 3 months through 38 months with a mean TIR of 12.56 months and a standard deviation of 11.77. The IQs for the CA-12 group ranged from 61 through 73 with a mean IQ of 68.67 and a standard deviation of 5.36.

CA-13 Group. For the CA-13 group, CAs ranged from 156 months through 167 months with a mean CA of 163.00 months and a standard deviation of 3.19. The TIR ranged from 1 month through 55 months with a mean TIR of 19.09 months and a standard deviation of 21.52. IQs for the CA-13 group ranged from 55 through 70 with a mean IQ of 65.18 and a standard deviation of 4.85.

CA-14 Group. For the CA-14 group, CAs ranged from 168 months through 179 months with a mean CA of 174.00 and a standard deviation of 3.71. The TIR ranged from 2 months through 60 months with a mean TIR of 20.92 months and a standard deviation of 20.92. The range of IQs was from 54 through 77 with a mean IQ of 65.63 and a standard deviation of 6.14.

CA-15 Group. For the CA-15 group, CAs ranged from 180 months through 191 months with a mean CA of 186.07 months and a standard deviation of 3.28. The TIR ranged from 8 months through 48 months with a mean TIR of 29.07 months and a standard deviation of 12.16. The IQs for the CA-15 group ranged from 63 through 78 with a mean IQ of 69.13 and a standard deviation of 5.60.

CA-16 Group. For the CA-16 group, CAs ranged from 192 months through 198 months with a mean of 194.71 months and a standard deviation of 2.63. The TIR ranged from 7 months through 40 months with a mean of 28.14 months and a standard deviation of 12.97. The range of IQs for the CA-16 group was from 50 through 77 with a mean of 66.14 and a standard deviation of 9.30.

Comparison of the Five CA Groups on TIR, IQ, and CA

A simple one way analysis of variance was computed on TIR and IQ for the 5 CA groupings. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF THE FIVE CHRONOLOGICAL AGE GROUPS ON TIME-IN-RESIDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT

Group	Time-in-Residence (months)		Intelligence Quotient	
	$\bar{X}$	F	$\bar{X}$	F
CA-12	12.56		68.67	
CA-13	19.09		65.18	
CA-14	22.13	1.63	65.63	1.10
CA-15	29.07		69.13	
CA-16	28.14		66.14	

$F_{.05}$ with 4, 53 df = 2.55, two-tailed test

For TIR, the F value (1.63) is not significant at the .05 level of confidence and indicates a non-significant difference among the five CA groups on this variable. Similarly, the F value (1.10) derived for IQ indicates a non-significant difference among the groups.

It was not necessary to analyze differences on CA for the groups as they were established on 12 months differences in CA. An inspection of means on CA shown in Table 4 indicates the differences are in accordance with the design of the study.

Time-in-Residence Sub-groups. For the Total Sample, TIR ranged from 1 month through 60 months with a mean TIR of 22.59 months and a standard deviation of 17.41. Five sub-groupings established on TIR were formed from the Total Sample. All subjects in residence from 1 month through 12 months were assigned to a sub-group designated TIR-1. All subjects in residence from 13 months through 24 months were assigned to a sub-group designated TIR-2. Subjects in residence from 25 months through 36 months were assigned to a sub-group designated TIR-3. Subjects in residence from 37 months through 48 months were assigned to a sub-group designated TIR-4. All subjects in residence from 49 months through 60 months were assigned to a sub-group designated TIR-5.

TIR-1 Group. For the TIR-1 group, CAs ranged from 145 months through 196 months with a mean CA of 166.31 and a standard deviation of 13.18. The range of TIR for the

TIR-1 group was from 1 month through 12 months with a mean of 6.65 months and a standard deviation of 3.59. The IQs ranged from 54 through 78 with a mean IQ of 65.65 and a standard deviation of 6.53.

TIR-2 Group. For the TIR-2 group, CAs ranged from 159 months through 196 months with a mean CA of 181.00 months and a standard deviation of 12.50. TIR ranged from 15 months through 22 months with a mean of 18.43 months and a standard deviation of 2.51. The range of IQs was from 62 through 77 with a mean IQ of 69.43 and a standard deviation of 6.27.

TIR-3 Group. For the TIR-3 group, CAs ranged from 146 months through 192 months with a mean CA of 179.75 months and a standard deviation of 15.29. The TIR ranged from 26 months through 31 months with a mean TIR of 28.38 months and a standard deviation of 1.77. IQs ranged from 66 through 76 with a mean IQ of 70.00 and a standard deviation of 4.00.

TIR-4 Group. For the TIR-4 group, CAs ranged from 148 months through 197 months with a mean CA of 183.50

months and a standard deviation of 13.61. TIR ranged from 37 months through 48 months with a mean of 42.83 months and a standard deviation of 3.81. The range of IQs was from 50 through 76 with a mean IQ of 65.92 and a standard deviation of 6.93.

TIR-5 Group. For the TIR-5 group, CAs ranged from 166 months through 177 months with a mean CA of 169.80 and a standard deviation of 4.97 months. TIR ranged from 49 months through 60 months with a mean TIR of 53.40 months and a standard deviation of 4.28. IQs ranged for the TIR-5 group from 65 through 72 with a mean IQ of 68.20 and a standard deviation of 2.78.

Comparison of the Five TIR Groups on CA, IQ, and TIR

A simple one way analysis of variance was computed on CA and IQ for the five TIR groupings. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 6.

For CA, the F-value (4.85) is significant at the .05 level of confidence and indicates a significant difference among the five TIR groups on this variable.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF THE FIVE TIME-IN-RESIDENCE GROUPS ON CHRONOLOGICAL AGE AND INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT

Group	Chronological Age (months)		Intelligence Quotient	
	$\overline{X}$	F	$\overline{X}$	F
TIR-1	166.31		65.65	
TIR-2	181.00		69.43	
TIR-3	179.75	4.85*	70.00	1.22
TIR-4	183.50		65.92	
TIR-5	169.80		68.20	

*$p < .05$, two-tailed test
$F_{.05}$ with 4, 53 df = 2.55

To determine where the significant difference lay, a one way analysis of variance was computed on CA between each of the TIR groups. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 7.

F-values obtained indicate a significant difference in CA between the TIR-1 group and the TIR-2, TIR-3, and TIR-4 groups. A significant difference in CA exists between the TIR-4 and TIR-5 groups. CA differences between other groupings are not significant.

The F-value (1.22) derived from the analysis for IQ indicates a non-significant difference among the groups on this variable.

TABLE 7

F-VALUES OBTAINED IN THE COMPARISON OF THE FIVE TIR GROUPS ON CHRONOLOGICAL AGE

	TIR-2	TIR-3	TIR-4	TIR-5
TIR-1	6.99*	5.92*	13.69**	.33
TIR-2		.03	.16	3.53
TIR-3			.33	1.93
TIR-4				4.65
TIR-5				

*$p < .05$, two-tailed test

**$p < .01$, two-tailed test

It was not necessary to analyze differences on TIR for the groups as they were established on the basis of 12-months' differences on TIR. An inspection of means on TIR shown in Table 4 indicates the differences are in accordance with the design of the study.

Instrumentation

Two tests developed by Gardner and Thompson[1] were selected to measure the ethical, moral, and social value-beliefs of subjects selected for this investigation. The tests selected were: 1) the Personal VEMS test (VEMS is an abbreviation for Values: Ethical, Moral, Social), and

---

[1] Eric Gardner and Thompson, op. cit.

2) the Impersonal VEMS test, male forms.

These two tests were developed by Gardner and Thompson in their extensive investigation "directed toward the construction and psychometric refinement of several scales to measure the prescription or 'ought to' values judged to be important in the interpersonal relations of adolescent boys and girls."[1]

Permission to reproduce these tests was secured by this investigator from Dr. Eric F. Gardner, Professor of Education and Psychology, Syracuse University. Examples of these two tests are shown in Appendix B.

Each test is designed to measure ethical, moral, and social values judged to be important in the interpersonal relationships of adolescent boys. The values selected by the authors in the development of the scales were drawn from a listing previously secured by the research of Witryol and Thompson.

The Personal VEMS test is presented in a form that is highly personal to the respondent. In this test he is asked to write the name of his best friend in blanks left in the several stories that serve as test situations.

---

[1] *Ibid*.

This instrument presents the respondent with a series of conflicts in each of which he is forced to choose between two alternative actions in order to resolve the conflict. The alternative ways of responding were designed to reflect seven values: loyalty, honesty, truthfulness, kindness, generosity, conformity, and impunitiveness.

Each of these seven values are paired with every other value as embodied in a possible resolution of a conflict. Twenty-one problem situations (all possible combinations of 7 values presented 2 at a time as possible courses of action in a problem situation) are presented to the respondent.

The highest possible score for a given value is 6 which a respondent would receive if he selected that value as representing what he "ought to do" in all combinations with the other values. This paired-combination scaling procedure provides a measure for ranking these basic ethical, moral, and social values in a personal setting.

Test-retest reliability estimates obtained with the Personal VEMS for 108 ninth grade boys[1] were Loyalty

---

[1] Considered normative group.

(.55), Honesty (.59), Truthfulness (.41), Kindness (.38), Generosity (.39), Conformity (.59), and Impunitiveness (.39).

The Impersonal VEMS test is very similar to the Personal VEMS but is presented in a third-person format (e.g., "What do you think Bob ought to do" rather than "What do you think you ought to do").

This scale presents story situations that serve as test situations involving other adolescents. The assumption is that the respondent will identify with the feelings of the central character in each conflict situation.

Two of the seven values employed in the Personal VEMS are combined into one category for the Impersonal VEMS test. Kindness and Generosity are pooled in the category: Kind-Generous.

Fifteen conflict situations (all possible combinations of six values taken two at a time) are written for each of the following environmental settings: School, Home, and Outside Home and School. This provides a test consisting of 45 different conflicts.

The highest possible score for a given value is 15 which a respondent would receive if he selected that value as representing what he "ought to do" in all combinations with the other values in the three environmental settings of Home, School, and Outside Home and School. This instrument provides a measure for comparing the values hierarchies of different groups of adolescents.

These two instruments were selected by the investigator as appropriate for an attack on the problem under investigation. The situations presented by the tests are those that might occur in the life of educable mentally retarded secondary school students. Although the tests presented a complex of affairs that might be considered foreign to an institution setting, the test situations appeared similar to those in which the subjects might have been judged when in the open community. The test situations also appeared to be similar to those in which the subjects might eventually be involved and judged upon release to the community.

Although readability was not measured, the investigator considered the problem situations to be written at a listening vocabulary level commensurate with an EMR adolescent's ability. Because it was felt that not all words might be in the subjects' reading vocabularies, the tests were read to them.

The problem situations seemed to be those that an EMR adolescent boy could conceptualize and identify with. Although the tests seem more appropriate for middle-class high school students, there was no reason to believe the tests inappropriate for lower-class subjects.

On the Personal VEMS test, respondents' scores could range from 0 to 6 for each variable.

On the Impersonal VEMS test, respondents make choices in each of three environmental settings. Scores could range from 0 to 5 for each variable within each environmental situation. Analysis was done using the total score for a particular value; therefore, scores could range from 0 to 15 for each value.

Test-retest reliability estimates obtained with the Impersonal VEMS for 108 ninth grade boys[1] were

---

[1] Considered normative group.

Loyalty (.52), Honesty (.52), Truthfulness (.44), Kindness-Generosity (.57), Conformity (.34), and Impunitiveness (.50).

Testing

Establishing a good rapport with institutionalized persons might be considered a problem. It may be felt by some readers that institutionalized persons may be withdrawn, shy, bashful with, or fearful of outsiders and others with whom they are not acquainted or with whom they have little contact. In the opinion of the investigator, no subject revealed these characteristics.

On the other hand, it is held by Zigler that institutionalized persons ". . . tend to have been relatively deprived of adult contact and approval and hence have a higher motivation to procure such contact and approval than do normal . . ."[1] persons. It was desired by the investigator that the subjects selected would attempt to please the examiner and would respond to questions with answers they thought would please the examiner. In this way, it seemed, the subjects would reveal with more valid results what they thought others ought to do, ought to say, and how they ought to behave.

---

[1] Edward Zigler, "Rigidity in the Feebleminded," Readings on the Exceptional Child, ed. E. Philip Trapp and Philip Himelstein (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1962), p. 151.

Administration of Tests

Subjects meeting selection criteria were administered the Personal VEMS and Impersonal VEMS tests by one of three examiners.[1] These tests were read by an examiner to the subjects in small groups or individually.

Each subject, with a copy of the test before him, was instructed to follow the text of each item as it was read aloud by the examiner. Subjects marked their choices directly on their test booklets.

When a subject, in any way, indicated he did not seem to understand a problem situation, the examiner re-read the item. If after the second reading the subject indicated he still did not understand the problem situation, the examiner paraphrased the item without intentional distortion or change in concept.

Testing was usually completed within a 50 to 60 minute testing session. In some sessions a subject verbalized tiredness. When this occurred a "short stretch break" was immediately taken.

A short time break occurred in testing between the administration of the two instruments. During this time period, the examiner, in a general way, maintained a good rapport with a subject by engaging in "general" conversation.

---

[1] The three examiners included Mr. John Junkala and Mr. Douglas Howard, Advanced Graduate Students in Special Education, Syracuse University, and the writer.

None of the 58 subjects tested indicated a disinterest or openly refused to take part in the study.

Scoring the Gardner-Thompson Scales

Respondents were asked to indicate with a check mark their choice for each item opposite the number of each item as it was read aloud by the examiner. Respondents marked their choices directly on a test booklet. Separate test booklets were provided for the *Personal VEMS* test and the *Impersonal VEMS* test. An example of both test booklets is shown in Appendix B.

Individual choices were transferred by the investigator from the test booklets to answer sheets similar to those developed by Gardner and Thompson.[1] An example of the answer sheet developed for each test is shown in Appendix B following each test booklet.

Answer sheets were scored with a cutout stencil similar to those developed by Gardner and Thompson.[1] An example of a cutout stencil for each test is shown with the answer sheet. The examples show the key used for the value Loyalty and lists the keying for the other values.

---

[1] Eric Gardner and Thompson, *op. cit.*

In scoring the investigator counted the number of responses given by the respondent for each value. This number was recorded in the appropriate space on the chart in the lower right hand corner of the answer sheet.

Analysis of the Data

Sub-groups from the Total Sample were established for time-in-residence, institution of residence, chronological age, and race. The differences between sub-groups on CA, TIR, and IQ were analyzed through the use of a simple one way analysis of variance. The .05 level of significance was selected for rejecting the null hypothesis of no difference.

Means were calculated for the Total Sample and each sub-group for each of the value-belief variables measured by the Personal VEMS and Impersonal VEMS tests. The differences between groupings were analyzed through the application of one way analyses of variance.

---

[1] *Ibid*.

Correlations were computed between TIR scores and each of the value-belief scores for the Total Sample and each sub-group. The correlations were compared.

All correlation coefficients were tested to determine whether or not they were significantly different from zero (0.0).

The predicted direction of change for specific value-beliefs stated in hypothesis form at the end of Chapter I may appear to infer that an institution experience is detrimental in certain value-belief areas. To prevent erroneous assumptions, then, it must be noted that the forced-choice instruments utilized in the study require that as selection by respondents is made in one value-belief, a corresponding reduction is forced in another value-belief.

A zero score, therefore, in a value-area was not interpreted as lack of belief but rather as lack of preference.

The hypothesized direction of change was made arbitrarily by the investigator for academic purposes only rather than on anticipated findings or previous research.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This study utilized 58 subjects from the population of two New York State Schools for the Mentally Retarded. The subjects met selection criteria outlined in Chapter III. The subjects could be characterized as institutionalized, educable mentally retarded, lower-class, delinquent, adolescent males of Familial, Cultural-familial, or Undifferentiated etiology.

The primary research hypothesis was concerned with the relative influence of time-in-residence (TIR) on selected value-beliefs of educable mentally retarded (EMR), delinquent, adolescent males in state institutions for the mentally retarded. The 58 subjects were administered the Personal VEMS and Impersonal VEMS tests.[1]

---

[1] VEMS is an abbreviation for Values: Ethical, Moral, and Social.

Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the Total Sample, RSS, SSS, SSS-A, SSS-B, and White Groups

Means were calculated for value-belief scores obtained on the Personal VEMS test for the Total Sample, Rome State School (RSS), Syracuse State School (SSS), Syracuse State School White (SSS-A), Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B), and combined white (WHITE) groups. These means are shown in Table 8.

Included in Table 8 are mean scores reported by Gardner and Thompson[1] for 108 ninth grade boys from Central New York Suburban Schools. Results for the ninth grade group were considered normative and included for comparison purposes.

Among the seven variables measured, Honesty was given the highest mean score by all groups. The mean scores for Conformity were lowest among all variables measured for all groups. These findings are consistent with the normative data.

Comparisons were made between several groupings established on institution of residence and race to

---

[1] Eric Gardner and Thompson, op. cit.

TABLE 8

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OBTAINED WITH THE PERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND SUB-GROUPINGS ESTABLISHED ON INSTITUTION AND RACE COMPARED WITH NINTH GRADE BOYS FROM CENTRAL NEW YORK SUBURBAN SCHOOLS

		RSS (N-16)	SSS (N=42)	SSS-White (N=20)	SSS-Negro (N=22)	RSS + SSS White (N=36)	Total Sample (N=58)	Ninth Grade Boys (N=108)
Loyalty	$\bar{X}$	3.00	2.41	2.65	2.18	2.81	2.57	2.87
	SD	1.41	1.01	1.18	0.80	1.28	1.16	1.30
Honesty	$\bar{X}$	3.81	4.17	4.10	4.23	3.97	4.07	3.47
	SD	1.22	1.08	1.12	1.07	1.16	1.12	1.33
Truthfulness	$\bar{X}$	3.69	3.86	3.65	4.05	3.67	3.81	3.11
	SD	0.95	1.16	1.23	1.09	1.10	1.10	1.07
Kindness	$\bar{X}$	2.63	3.02	3.10	2.96	2.89	2.91	3.43
	SD	1.36	1.12	1.07	1.17	1.21	1.19	0.89
Generosity	$\bar{X}$	3.44	3.07	2.85	3.27	3.11	3.17	3.33
	SD	1.21	1.18	1.27	1.08	1.26	1.19	1.47
Conformity	$\bar{X}$	1.00	1.43	1.65	1.23	1.36	1.31	1.45
	SD	0.97	1.17	1.09	1.23	1.07	1.13	1.53
Impunitiveness	$\bar{X}$	3.44	3.02	3.00	3.05	3.19	3.14	3.15
	SD	0.81	1.12	1.03	1.21	0.95	1.05	1.15

determine differences between groups on each of the value areas. A simple one way analysis of variance and a t-test were computed to determine differences.[1] The results of these analyses are shown in Tables 9 through 13. The .05 level of confidence was selected for rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the RSS and SSS Groups

Table 9 depicts the means, standard deviations, F-values, and t's obtained with the Personal VEMS for the Rome State School (RSS) and Syracuse State School (SSS) groups.

No F-value or t was significant at the .05 level, indicating no significant differences between mean scores in the value areas measured.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the RSS and SSS-A Groups

Table 10 depicts the means, standard deviations, F-values, and t's obtained with the Personal VEMS instrument

---

[1] All computations were made by use of the TSAR System with an IBM 7074 digital computer. The work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant GP-1137.

TABLE 9

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F-VALUES, AND *t*'s OBTAINED WITH THE *PERSONAL VEMS* INSTRUMENT FOR THE ROME STATE SCHOOL (RSS) AND SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL (SSS) GROUPS

	Group	$\overline{X}$	SD	
Loyalty	RSS	3.00	1.41	$F = 3.19$
	SSS	2.41	1.01	$t = 1.79$
Honesty	RSS	3.81	1.22	$F = 1.16$
	SSS	4.17	1.08	$t = 1.08$
Truthfulness	RSS	3.69	.95	$F = .27$
	SSS	3.86	1.16	$t = .52$
Kindness	RSS	2.63	1.36	$F = 1.31$
	SSS	3.02	1.12	$t = 1.15$
Generosity	RSS	3.44	1.21	$F = 1.11$
	SSS	3.07	1.18	$t = 1.05$
Conformity	RSS	1.00	.97	$F = 1.70$
	SSS	1.43	1.17	$t = 1.30$
Impunitiveness	RSS	3.44	.81	$F = 1.82$
	SSS	3.02	1.12	$t = 1.35$

$F_{.05}(1, 56) = 4.02$, two-tailed test.

$t_{.05}(56) = 2.01$

TABLE 10

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F-VALUES, AND t's OBTAINED WITH THE *PERSONAL VEMS* INSTRUMENT FOR THE ROME STATE SCHOOL (RSS) AND SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL WHITE (SSS-A) GROUPS

	Group	$\bar{X}$	SD	
Loyalty	RSS	3.00	1.41	F = .66
	SSS-A	2.65	1.18	t = .81
Honesty	RSS	3.81	1.22	F = .54
	SSS-A	4.10	1.12	t = .74
Truthfulness	RSS	3.69	.95	F = .01
	SSS-A	3.65	1.23	t = .10
Kindness	RSS	2.63	1.36	F = 1.38
	SSS-A	3.10	1.07	t = 1.17
Generosity	RSS	3.44	1.21	F = 1.99
	SSS-A	2.85	1.27	t = 1.41
Conformity	RSS	1.00	.97	F = 3.49
	SSS-A	1.65	1.09	t = 1.87
Impunitiveness	RSS	3.44	.81	F = 1.93
	SSS-A	3.00	1.03	t = 1.39

$F_{.05}$ (1, 34) = 4.13, two-tailed test.

$t_{.05}$ (34) = 2.03

for the Rome State School (RSS)* and Syracuse State School (SSS-A) groups.

No F-value or _t_ obtained was significant (p>.05). This indicates no significant difference between mean scores in the _seven_ value areas measured.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the RSS and SSS-B Groups

Table 11 shows the means, standard deviations, F-values, and _t_'s obtained with the _Personal VEMS_ test for the Rome State School (RSS)* and Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) groups.

Except for _Loyalty_ scores, the F-values and _t_'s are non-significant. The F-value (5.16) and the _t_-ratio (2.27) between _Loyalty_ scores indicates a significant difference on this variable for the RSS and SSS-B groups.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the SSS-A and SSS-B Groups

Table 12 shows the means, standard deviations, F-values, and _t_'s obtained with the _Personal VEMS_ test for

---

*Rome State School (RSS) group consists of white subjects only.

TABLE 11

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F-VALUES, AND _t_'s OBTAINED WITH THE PERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT FOR THE ROME STATE SCHOOL (RSS) AND SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL NEGRO (SSS-B) GROUPS

	Group	$\bar{X}$	SD	
Loyalty	RSS	3.00	1.41	F = 5.16*
	SSS-B	2.18	.80	_t_ = 2.27*
Honesty	RSS	3.81	1.22	F = 1.24
	SSS-B	4.23	1.07	_t_ = 1.11
Truthfulness	RSS	3.69	.95	F = 1.11
	SSS-B	4.05	1.09	_t_ = 1.06
Kindness	RSS	2.63	1.36	F = .64
	SSS-B	2.96	1.17	_t_ = .80
Generosity	RSS	3.44	1.21	F = .20
	SSS-B	3.27	1.08	_t_ = .44
Conformity	RSS	1.00	.97	F = .38
	SSS-B	1.23	1.23	_t_ = .61
Impunitiveness	RSS	3.44	.81	F = 1.25
	SSS-B	3.05	1.21	_t_ = 1.12

*$p < .05$, two-tailed test.

$F_{.05}$ (1, 36) = 4.11
$t_{.05}$ (36) = 2.02

TABLE 12

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F-VALUES, AND *t*'s OBTAINED WITH THE *PERSONAL VEMS* INSTRUMENT FOR THE SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL WHITE (SSS-A) AND SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL NEGRO (SSS-B) GROUPS

	Group	$\overline{X}$	SD	
Loyalty	SSS-A	2.65	1.18	F = 2.31
	SSS-B	2.18	.80	*t* = 1.52
Honesty	SSS-A	4.10	1.12	F = .14
	SSS-B	4.23	1.07	*t* = .38
Truthfulness	SSS-A	3.65	1.23	F = 1.23
	SSS-B	4.05	1.09	*t* = 1.11
Kindness	SSS-A	3.10	1.07	F = .18
	SSS-B	2.96	1.17	*t* = .42
Generosity	SSS-A	2.85	1.27	F = 1.36
	SSS-B	3.27	1.08	*t* = 1.17
Conformity	SSS-A	1.65	1.09	F = 1.38
	SSS-B	1.23	1.23	*t* = 1.17
Impunitiveness	SSS-A	3.00	1.03	F = .02
	SSS-B	3.05	1.21	*t* = .13

$F_{.05}$ (1, 40) = 4.08, two-tailed test.
$t_{.05}$ (40) = 2.02

the Syracuse State School white (SSS-A) and Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) groups.

No F-value or _t_ was significant ($p>.05$). The results of these analyses indicate that differences between mean scores on the value areas measured are not significant.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the WHITE and SSS-B Groups

Table 13 depicts the means, standard deviations, F-values, and _t_'s obtained with the _Personal VEMS_ instrument for the combined grouping of Rome State School and Syracuse State School white subjects (WHITE) and the Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) group.

The analysis of variance produced non-significant F-values in all value-belief areas except _Loyalty_. Both the F-value (4.20) and the _t_-ratio (2.05) are significant at the .05 level.

The results of these analyses indicate a significant difference in mean scores on _Loyalty_ between the Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) group and the combined white (WHITE) grouping.

TABLE 13

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F-VALUES, AND _t_'s OBTAINED WITH THE _PERSONAL VEMS_ INSTRUMENT FOR THE COMBINED ROME AND SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL WHITE (WHITE) AND SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL NEGRO (SSS-B) GROUPS

	Group	$\overline{X}$	SD	
Loyalty	White	2.81	1.28	F = 4.20*
	SSS-B	2.18	.80	_t_ = 2.05*
Honesty	White	3.97	1.16	F = .70
	SSS-B	4.23	1.07	_t_ = .84
Truthfulness	White	3.67	1.10	F = 1.64
	SSS-B	4.05	1.09	_t_ = 1.28
Kindness	White	2.89	1.21	F = .04
	SSS-B	2.96	1.17	_t_ = .20
Generosity	White	3.11	1.26	F = .25
	SSS-B	3.27	1.08	_t_ = .50
Conformity	White	1.36	1.07	F = .19
	SSS-B	1.23	1.23	_t_ = .44
Impunitiveness	White	3.19	.95	F = .27
	SSS-B	3.05	1.21	_t_ = .52

*$p < .05$, two-tailed test.

$F_{.05}$ (1, 56) = 4.02

$\underline{t}_{.05}$ (56) = 2.01

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the Total Sample and the Ninth Grade Normative Group

A visual inspection of mean scores on the Personal VEMS depicted in Table 8 shows the value hierarchy of the total sample of delinquent retardates to be similar, with one exception, to that of the normative group.

Truthfulness was ranked second and Kindness was ranked fifth among the seven values by the EMR delinquents. Conversely, Truthfulness was ranked fifth and Kindness was ranked second by the ninth grade normative group.

The other values measured by the Personal VEMS test were ranked identically by these two groups.

A further inspection of mean scores of the subgroupings shown in Table 8 indicated that Honesty is ranked first and Conformity is ranked last by all groups. The hierarchial ordering of the remaining five values, however, is different for all groups.

Summary

Comparisons of the Personal VEMS scores made by delinquent EMR's grouped according to residence and race show that few differences exist in the emphasis or stress placed upon the individual values measured. The only significant difference found was on Loyalty scores.

Significant differences in Loyalty scores were found between the RSS and SSS-B groups and between the SSS-B and WHITE groups. The differences between the Loyalty scores of the SSS-A group and those of the RSS group or those of the SSS-B groups, and between the RSS and SSS groups, however, were not significant.

Ranking of values was similar for the Total Sample and the ninth grade normative group with the exception of Truthfulness and Kindness whose ranks were transposed by the two populations. For the sub-groups, however, there was no consistent pattern in the hierarchial ordering of the values.

Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS for the Total Sample and the RSS, SSS, SSS-A, SSS-B, WHITE, and Ninth Grade Normative Groups

Means were calculated for value-belief scores obtained on the Impersonal VEMS test for the Total Sample and the RSS, SSS, SSS-A, SSS-B and WHITE groupings. These means are shown in Table 14. Included in Table 14 are mean scores reported by Gardner and Thompson for 108 ninth grade boys from Central New York Suburban Schools. Results on the ninth grade group were considered normative and included for gross comparison purposes.

Among the six variables measured, Honesty was given the highest mean score by all groupings except RSS which gave Truthfulness a higher mean score.

The mean scores for Impunitiveness are rated fourth, and the mean scores for Loyalty are rated fifth by all groups. Conformity scores were lowest among all values measured for all groups.

To determine whether differences between mean scores were significant among the groups, comparisons were made between several groupings established on institution

TABLE 14

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OBTAINED WITH THE IMPERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND SUB-GROUPINGS ESTABLISHED ON INSTITUTION AND RACE COMPARED WITH NINTH GRADE BOYS FROM CENTRAL NEW YORK SUBURBAN SCHOOLS

		RSS (N=16)	SSS (N=42)	SSS-White (N=20)	SSS-Negro (N=22)	RSS + SSS White (N=36)	Total Sample (N=58)	Ninth Grade Boys (N=108)
Loyalty	$\overline{X}$	5.25	5.60	6.00	5.23	5.67	5.50	5.34
	SD	2.41	1.81	2.08	1.48	2.23	1.98	2.05
Honesty	$\overline{X}$	9.69	9.67	9.35	9.96	9.50	9.67	9.67
	SD	2.09	2.31	2.60	2.04	2.36	2.24	2.13
Truthfulness	$\overline{X}$	9.06	9.33	8.90	9.73	8.97	9.26	9.64
	SD	2.11	2.09	1.68	2.37	1.86	2.08	1.96
Kindness-Generosity	$\overline{X}$	9.81	9.45	9.00	9.86	9.36	9.55	9.52
	SD	1.83	1.77	1.69	1.78	1.78	1.78	1.74
Conformity	$\overline{X}$	3.81	3.43	3.55	3.32	3.67	3.53	2.17
	SD	2.14	2.40	1.79	2.89	1.93	2.32	1.78
Impunitiveness	$\overline{X}$	7.44	7.52	8.20	6.91	7.86	7.50	8.60
	SD	2.16	2.23	2.19	2.14	2.18	2.19	1.56

and race. A one way analysis of variance and a *t* test were computed to determine significance of differences. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 15 through 19. The .05 level of confidence was selected for rejection of the null hypothesis.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for the RSS and SSS Groups

Table 15 depicts the means, standard deviations, F-values, and *t*'s obtained with the *Impersonal VEMS* instrument for the Rome State School (RSS) and Syracuse State School (SSS) groups.

No F-value or *t* was significant at the .05 level. This indicated no significant differences between mean scores for the RSS and SSS groups in the *six* values measured.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for the RSS and SSS-A Groups

Table 16 shows the means, standard deviations, F-values, and *t*'s obtained with the *Impersonal VEMS* for

TABLE 15

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F-VALUES, AND *t*'s OBTAINED WITH THE *IMPERSONAL VEMS* INSTRUMENT FOR THE ROME STATE SCHOOL (RSS) AND SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL (SSS) GROUPS

	Group	$\overline{X}$	SD	
Loyalty	RSS	5.25	2.41	F = .35
	SSS	5.60	1.81	*t* = .59
Honesty	RSS	9.69	2.09	F = .00
	SSS	9.67	2.31	*t* = .03
Truthfulness	RSS	9.06	2.11	F = .19
	SSS	9.33	2.09	*t* = .44
Kindness-Generosity	RSS	9.81	1.83	F = .47
	SSS	9.45	1.77	*t* = .69
Conformity	RSS	3.81	2.14	F = .31
	SSS	3.43	2.40	*t* = .56
Impunitiveness	RSS	7.33	2.16	F = .02
	SSS	7.52	2.23	*t* = .13

$F_{.05}$ (1, 56) = 4.02, two-tailed test.
$t_{.05}$ (56) = 2.01

TABLE 16

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F-VALUES, AND t's OBTAINED WITH THE IMPERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT FOR THE ROME STATE SCHOOL (RSS) AND SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL WHITE (SSS-A) GROUPS

	Group	$\overline{X}$	SD	
Loyalty	RSS	5.25	2.41	F = 1.01
	SSS-A	6.00	2.08	t = 1.00
Honesty	RSS	9.69	2.09	F = .18
	SSS-A	9.35	2.60	t = .42
Truthfulness	RSS	9.06	2.11	F = .07
	SSS-A	8.90	1.68	t = .26
Kindness-Generosity	RSS	9.81	1.83	F = 1.91
	SSS-A	9.00	1.69	t = 1.38
Conformity	RSS	3.81	2.14	F = .16
	SSS-A	3.55	1.79	t = .40
Impunitiveness	RSS	7.44	2.16	F = 1.09
	SSS-A	8.20	2.19	t = 1.04

$F_{.05}$ (1, 34) = 4.13, two-tailed test.
$t_{.05}$ (34) = 2.03

the Rome State School (RSS)* and Syracuse State School white (SSS-A) groups.

The F-values and _t_'s obtained are not significant at the .05 level of confidence. These analyses indicate no significant differences between mean scores in the value areas measured for the two groups.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for the RSS and SSS-B Groups

Table 17 depicts the means, standard deviations, F-values, and _t_'s obtained with the _Impersonal VEMS_ for the Rome State School (RSS)* and Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) groups.

No F-value or _t_ was significant at the .05 level of confidence. These results show no significant differences between RSS and SSS-B groups on value-belief scores in the _six_ values measured.

---

*Rome State School (RSS) group consists of white subjects only.

TABLE 17

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F-VALUES, AND t's OBTAINED WITH THE IMPERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT FOR THE ROME STATE SCHOOL (RSS) AND SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL NEGRO (SSS-B) GROUPS

	Group	$\overline{X}$	SD	
Loyalty	RSS	5.25	2.41	F = .00
	SSS-B	5.23	1.48	t = .04
Honesty	RSS	9.69	2.09	F = .16
	SSS-B	9.96	2.04	t = .40
Truthfulness	RSS	9.06	2.11	F = .80
	SSS-B	9.73	2.37	t = .89
Kindness-Generosity	RSS	9.81	1.83	F = .01
	SSS-B	9.86	1.78	t = .09
Conformity	RSS	3.81	2.14	F = .34
	SSS-B	3.32	2.89	t = .58
Impunitiveness	RSS	7.44	2.16	F = .56
	SSS-B	6.91	2.14	t = .75

$F_{.05}$ (1, 36) = 4.11, two-tailed test.
$t_{.05}$ (36) = 2.02

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for the SSS-A and SSS-B Groups

Table 18 shows the means, standard deviations, F-values, and t's obtained with the Impersonal VEMS test for the Syracuse State School white (SSS-A) and Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) groups.

No F-value or t was significant at the .05 level which indicates that differences between mean scores in each of the values measured are not significant for these two groups.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for the WHITE and SSS-B Groups

Table 19 shows the means, standard deviations, F-values, and t's obtained with the Impersonal VEMS instrument for the combined grouping of Rome State School and Syracuse State School white subjects (WHITE) and the Syracuse State School Negro (SSS-B) group.

The analyses of variance produced non-significant F-values in all value-belief areas measured. Similarly, the t-ratios are not significant at the .05 level of

TABLE 18

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F-VALUES, AND *t*'s OBTAINED WITH THE *IMPERSONAL VEMS* INSTRUMENT FOR THE SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL WHITE (SSS-A) AND SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL NEGRO (SSS-B) GROUPS

	Group	$\bar{X}$	SD	
Loyalty	SSS-A	6.00	2.08	F = 1.96
	SSS-B	5.23	1.48	*t* = 1.40
Honesty	SSS-A	9.35	2.60	F = .71
	SSS-B	9.96	2.04	*t* = .84
Truthfulness	SSS-A	8.90	1.68	F = 1.67
	SSS-B	9.73	2.37	*t* = 1.29
Kindness-Generosity	SSS-A	9.00	1.69	F = 2.59
	SSS-B	9.86	1.78	*t* = 1.61
Conformity	SSS-A	3.55	1.79	F = .10
	SSS-B	3.32	2.89	*t* = .31
Impunitiveness	SSS-A	8.20	2.19	F = 3.73
	SSS-B	6.91	2.14	*t* = 1.93

$F_{.05}$ (1, 40) = 4.08, two-tailed test.
$\underline{t}_{.05}$ (40) = 2.02

TABLE 19

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F-VALUES, AND *t*'s OBTAINED WITH THE *IMPERSONAL VEMS* INSTRUMENT FOR THE COMBINED ROME AND SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL WHITE (WHITE) AND SYRACUSE STATE SCHOOL NEGRO (SSS-B) GROUPS

	Group	$\bar{X}$	SD	
Loyalty	White	5.67	2.23	F = .67
	SSS-B	5.23	1.48	*t* = .82
Honesty	White	9.50	2.36	F = .56
	SSS-B	9.96	2.04	*t* = .75
Truthfulness	White	8.97	1.86	F = 1.82
	SSS-B	9.73	2.37	*t* = 1.35
Kindness-Generosity	White	9.36	1.78	F = 1.09
	SSS-B	9.86	1.78	*t* = 1.05
Conformity	White	3.67	1.93	F = .31
	SSS-B	3.32	2.89	*t* = .55
Impunitiveness	White	7.86	2.18	F = 2.64
	SSS-B	6.91	2.14	*t* = 1.63

$F_{.05}$ (1, 56) = 4.02, two-tailed test.
$t_{.05}$ (56) = 2.01

confidence. The results of these analyses indicate that differences in mean scores are not significant.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for Total Sample and the 108 Ninth Grade Boys

A visual inspection of mean scores on the *Impersonal VEMS* test presented in Table 14 shows the value hierarchy of the total sample of delinquent retardates to be similar, with one exception, to that of the ninth grade normative group.

Kindness-Generosity is ranked second and *Truthfulness* is ranked third among the six values by the EMR delinquent group. On the other hand, *Truthfulness* is ranked second and *Kindness-Generosity* is ranked third by the ninth grade group.

The other values measured by the *Impersonal VEMS* test are ranked identically by the groups.

Summary

Comparisons of *Impersonal VEMS* scores from delinquent EMR's, grouped according to institution of residence and race show no significant differences in mean value-belief scores between groups.

Groupings within the total sample did not differ significantly from each other in the emphasis placed on separate values.

A visual inspection of mean scores on the *Impersonal VEMS* test shows slight differences in value rankings. Of note is the difference in ranking of *Kindness-Generosity* and *Truthfulness* by the Total Sample of delinquent retardates as compared to that of the ninth grade normative group.

Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for Five Chronological Age Groupings

Sub-groupings within the total sample were formed in view of possible differences in value-beliefs attributable to chronological age (CA). As defined in Chapter III, five groupings established on CA were formed by grouping 12-, 13-, 14-, 15-, and 16-year-old subjects.

Means were calculated for value scores obtained on the *Personal VEMS* test for the five CA groups. These means are shown in Table 20. Included are mean scores for the normative group of ninth grade boys.

Among the seven values measured, Honesty was given the highest mean score by 12-, 13-, and 14-year-old subjects. Truthfulness was given the highest mean score by 15- and 16-year-old subjects.

The mean scores for Conformity were lowest among all values measured for all groups.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the Five CA Groups

To determine differences among groups on each value area measured, a simple one way analysis of variance was computed. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 21.

F-values for Honesty, Loyalty, Kindness, Generosity, and Impunitiveness were not significant and indicate no significant differences in mean scores among the five CA groups.

The F-value (3.22) on Truthfulness scores and the F-value (4.37) on Conformity scores are significant at the

TABLE 20

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OBTAINED WITH THE PERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT FOR FIVE CHRONOLOGICAL AGE GROUPS AT TWO NEW YORK STATE SCHOOLS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND FOR NINTH GRADE BOYS FROM CENTRAL NEW YORK SUBURBAN SCHOOLS

	CA-12 $\bar{X}$ CA=149.89 (N=9)	CA-13 $\bar{X}$ CA=163.00 (N=11)	CA-14 $\bar{X}$ CA=174.00 (N=16)	CA-15 $\bar{X}$ CA=186.07 (N=15)	CA-16 $\bar{X}$ CA=194.71 (N=7)	Total Sample $\bar{X}$ CA=173.79 (N=58)	Ninth Grade Boys (N=108)
Loyalty	$\bar{X}$ 2.33 SD 1.23	$\bar{X}$ 3.09 SD 1.22	$\bar{X}$ 2.13 SD 0.81	$\bar{X}$ 2.53 SD 1.06	$\bar{X}$ 3.14 SD 1.57	$\bar{X}$ 2.57 SD 1.16	$\bar{X}$ 2.87 SD 1.30
Honesty	$\bar{X}$ 4.22 SD 1.48	$\bar{X}$ 3.91 SD 1.30	$\bar{X}$ 4.50 SD 0.89	$\bar{X}$ 3.73 SD 1.10	$\bar{X}$ 3.86 SD 0.69	$\bar{X}$ 4.07 SD 1.12	$\bar{X}$ 3.47 SD 1.33
Truthfulness	$\bar{X}$ 3.78 SD 0.67	$\bar{X}$ 3.09 SD 1.14	$\bar{X}$ 3.56 SD 0.96	$\bar{X}$ 4.33 SD 0.98	$\bar{X}$ 4.43 SD 1.40	$\bar{X}$ 3.81 SD 1.10	$\bar{X}$ 3.11 SD 1.07
Kindness	$\bar{X}$ 2.89 SD 1.17	$\bar{X}$ 3.18 SD 1.33	$\bar{X}$ 2.69 SD 1.20	$\bar{X}$ 3.13 SD 0.92	$\bar{X}$ 2.57 SD 1.62	$\bar{X}$ 2.91 SD 1.19	$\bar{X}$ 3.43 SD 0.89
Generosity	$\bar{X}$ 2.78 SD 1.48	$\bar{X}$ 3.55 SD 0.93	$\bar{X}$ 3.00 SD 1.10	$\bar{X}$ 3.27 SD 1.22	$\bar{X}$ 3.29 SD 1.38	$\bar{X}$ 3.17 SD 1.19	$\bar{X}$ 3.33 SD 1.47
Conformity	$\bar{X}$ 1.89 SD 0.93	$\bar{X}$ 0.91 SD 1.05	$\bar{X}$ 1.94 SD 1.29	$\bar{X}$ 1.00 SD 0.76	$\bar{X}$ 0.43 SD 0.79	$\bar{X}$ 1.31 SD 1.13	$\bar{X}$ 1.45 SD 1.53
Impunitiveness	$\bar{X}$ 3.11 SD 1.27	$\bar{X}$ 3.27 SD 0.47	$\bar{X}$ 3.19 SD 1.11	$\bar{X}$ 2.93 SD 1.28	$\bar{X}$ 3.29 SD 0.95	$\bar{X}$ 3.14 SD 1.05	$\bar{X}$ 3.15 SD 1.15

TABLE 21

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND F-VALUES OBTAINED WITH THE *PERSONAL VEMS* INSTRUMENT FOR THE FIVE CHRONOLOGICAL AGE GROUPS

	Group	$\overline{X}$	SD	F
Loyalty	CA-12	2.33	1.23	1.77
	CA-13	3.09	1.22	
	CA-14	2.13	0.81	
	CA-15	2.53	1.06	
	CA-16	3.14	1.57	
Honesty	CA-12	4.22	1.48	1.09
	CA-13	3.91	1.30	
	CA-14	4.50	0.89	
	CA-15	3.73	1.10	
	CA-16	3.89	0.69	
Truthfulness	CA-12	3.78	0.67	3.22*
	CA-13	3.09	1.14	
	CA-14	3.56	0.96	
	CA-15	4.33	0.98	
	CA-16	4.43	1.40	
Kindness	CA-12	2.89	1.17	0.54
	CA-13	3.18	1.33	
	CA-14	2.69	1.20	
	CA-15	3.13	0.92	
	CA-16	2.57	1.62	
Generosity	CA-12	2.78	1.48	0.63
	CA-13	3.55	0.93	
	CA-14	3.00	1.10	
	CA-15	3.27	1.22	
	CA-16	3.29	1.38	
Conformity	CA-12	1.89	0.93	4.37*
	CA-13	0.91	1.05	
	CA-14	1.94	1.29	
	CA-15	1.00	0.76	
	CA-16	0.43	0.79	
Impunitiveness	CA-12	3.11	1.27	0.22
	CA-13	3.27	0.47	
	CA-14	3.19	1.11	
	CA-15	2.93	1.28	
	CA-16	3.29	0.95	

*$p < .05$, two-tailed test

$F_{.05}$ with 4, 53 df = 2.55

.05 level of confidence. These F-values indicate significant differences in mean scores for these two values among the five CA groups.

To determine where the differences lay among the means, analyses of variance were computed between all pairs of means. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 22.

On Truthfulness, significant F-values were obtained for differences between mean scores for the CA-13 and CA-15 group (8.96), for the CA-13 and CA-16 group (4.97), and for the CA-14 and CA-15 group (4.89).

On Conformity, significant F-values were obtained for differences between mean scores of the CA-12 and CA-15 group (6.57), CA-12 and CA-16 group (11.09), CA-13 and CA-14 group (4.81), CA-14 and CA-15 group (5.99), and the CA-14 and CA-16 group (8.13). These significant F-values indicate significant differences between mean scores for these pairings.

TABLE 22

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND F-VALUES OBTAINED BETWEEN PAIRS OF MEANS FOR ALL PAIRINGS OF THE FIVE CHRONOLOGICAL AGE GROUPS ON TRUTHFULNESS AND CONFORMITY MEASURED BY THE PERSONAL VEMS TEST

Group	Truthfulness			Conformity		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	F	$\bar{X}$	SD	F
CA-12	3.78	.67	2.55	1.89	.93	4.81*
CA-13	3.09	1.14		.91	1.05	
CA-12	3.78	.67	.35	1.89	.93	.01
CA-14	3.56	.96		1.94	1.29	
CA-12	3.78	.67	2.26	1.89	.93	6.57*
CA-15	4.33	.98		1.00	.76	
CA-12	3.78	.67	1.53	1.89	.93	11.09**
CA-16	4.43	1.40		.43	.79	
CA-13	3.09	1.14	1.35	.91	1.05	4.81*
CA-14	3.56	.96		1.94	1.29	
CA-13	3.09	1.14	8.96**	.91	1.05	.07
CA-15	4.33	.98		1.00	.76	
CA-13	3.09	1.14	4.97*	.91	1.05	1.08
CA-16	4.43	1.40		.43	.79	
CA-14	3.56	.96	4.89*	1.94	1.29	5.99*
CA-15	4.33	.98		1.00	.76	
CA-14	3.56	.96	2.99	1.94	1.29	8.13**
CA-16	4.43	1.40		.43	.79	
CA-15	4.33	.98	.03	1.00	.76	2.66
CA-16	4.43	1.40		.43	.79	

*p < .05, two-tailed test.

**p < .01.

Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for Five Chronological Age Groupings

Means were calculated for value scores obtained on the Impersonal VEMS instrument for the five CA groups. These means are shown in Table 23. (Included are the means reported for 108 Ninth Grade Boys and the Total Sample.)

Among the six values measured, Impunitiveness was rated fourth, Loyalty was rated fifth, and Conformity rated lowest by all groups.

Kindness-Generosity was given the highest mean score by the CA-12 and CA-13 groups. Truthfulness was given the highest mean score by the CA-16 group. Honesty was given the highest mean score by the CA-14, CA-15, Total Sample, and Ninth Grade Boys groups.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for the Five CA Groups

To determine differences among groups on each value measured, analyses of variance were computed. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 24.

TABLE 23

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OBTAINED WITH THE IMPERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT FOR FIVE CHRONOLOGICAL AGE GROUPS AT TWO NEW YORK STATE SCHOOLS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED, THE TOTAL SAMPLE, AND NINTH GRADE BOYS FROM CENTRAL NEW YORK SUBURBAN SCHOOLS

	CA-12 $\overline{X}$ CA=149.89 (N=9)	CA-13 $\overline{X}$ CA=163.00 (N=11)	CA-14 $\overline{X}$ CA=174.00 (N=16)	CA-15 $\overline{X}$ CA=186.07 (N=15)	CA-16 $\overline{X}$ CA=194.71 (N=7)	Total Sample $\overline{X}$ CA=173.79 (N=58)	Ninth Grade Boys (N=108)
Loyalty	$\overline{X}$ 6.56	$\overline{X}$ 6.55	$\overline{X}$ 5.38	$\overline{X}$ 4.80	$\overline{X}$ 4.29	$\overline{X}$ 5.50	$\overline{X}$ 5.34
	SD 2.56	SD 2.16	SD 1.36	SD 1.52	SD 1.98	SD 1.98	SD 2.05
Honesty	$\overline{X}$ 9.11	$\overline{X}$ 9.09	$\overline{X}$ 9.94	$\overline{X}$ 10.13	$\overline{X}$ 9.71	$\overline{X}$ 9.67	$\overline{X}$ 9.67
	SD 2.57	SD 2.55	SD 2.41	SD 2.03	SD 1.38	SD 2.24	SD 2.13
Truthfulness	$\overline{X}$ 8.22	$\overline{X}$ 8.73	$\overline{X}$ 9.00	$\overline{X}$ 10.00	$\overline{X}$ 10.43	$\overline{X}$ 9.26	$\overline{X}$ 9.64
	SD 2.77	SD 1.95	SD 1.97	SD 1.81	SD 1.40	SD 2.08	SD 1.96
Kindness-Generosity	$\overline{X}$ 9.89	$\overline{X}$ 10.36	$\overline{X}$ 9.88	$\overline{X}$ 8.60	$\overline{X}$ 9.14	$\overline{X}$ 9.55	$\overline{X}$ 9.52
	SD 2.09	SD 0.81	SD 1.46	SD 1.92	SD 2.27	SD 1.78	SD 1.74
Conformity	$\overline{X}$ 4.56	$\overline{X}$ 3.18	$\overline{X}$ 3.69	$\overline{X}$ 3.33	$\overline{X}$ 2.86	$\overline{X}$ 3.53	$\overline{X}$ 2.17
	SD 2.46	SD 2.04	SD 2.85	SD 2.13	SD 1.68	SD 2.32	SD 1.78
Impunitiveness	$\overline{X}$ 6.67	$\overline{X}$ 7.09	$\overline{X}$ 7.19	$\overline{X}$ 8.13	$\overline{X}$ 8.57	$\overline{X}$ 7.50	$\overline{X}$ 8.60
	SD 1.94	SD 1.70	SD 2.46	SD 2.00	SD 2.76	SD 2.19	SD 1.56

TABLE 24

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND F-VALUES OBTAINED WITH THE IMPERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT FOR THE FIVE CHRONOLOGICAL AGE GROUPS

	Group	$\overline{X}$	SD	F
Loyalty	CA-12	6.56	2.56	2.90*
	CA-13	6.55	2.16	
	CA-14	5.38	1.36	
	CA-15	4.80	1.52	
	CA-16	4.29	1.98	
Honesty	CA-12	9.11	2.57	0.53
	CA-13	9.09	2.55	
	CA-14	9.94	2.41	
	CA-15	10.13	2.03	
	CA-16	9.71	1.38	
Truthfulness	CA-12	8.22	2.77	1.95
	CA-13	8.73	1.95	
	CA-14	9.00	1.97	
	CA-15	10.00	1.81	
	CA-16	10.43	1.40	
Kindness-Generosity	CA-12	9.89	2.08	2.10
	CA-13	10.36	0.81	
	CA-14	9.88	1.46	
	CA-15	8.60	1.92	
	CA-16	9.14	2.27	
Conformity	CA-12	4.56	2.46	0.68
	CA-13	3.18	2.04	
	CA-14	3.69	2.85	
	CA-15	3.33	2.13	
	CA-16	2.86	1.68	
Impunitiveness	CA-12	6.67	1.94	1.25
	CA-13	7.09	1.70	
	CA-14	7.19	2.46	
	CA-15	8.13	2.00	
	CA-16	8.57	2.76	

* $p < .05$, two-tailed test

$F_{.05}$ with 4, 53 df = 2.55

F-values for Honesty, Truthfulness, Kindness-Generosity, Conformity, and Impunitiveness were non-significant ($p<.05$). These results indicate no significant differences in mean scores among the five CA groups on these values.

The F-value (2.90) on Loyalty was significant. To determine where the differences lay among the means, analyses of variance were computed between all pairs of means. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 25.

Significant F-values were found for the CA-12 and CA-15 pairing (4.51), the CA-13 and CA-15 pairing (5.86), and for the CA-13 and CA-16 pairing (4.98). These results indicate significant differences between the mean Loyalty scores for these pairings.

Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for Five Time-in-Residence Groupings

The primary research hypothesis was concerned with the relative influence of time-in-residence (TIR) on selected value-beliefs of educable mentally retarded (EMR), delinquent, adolescent males in state institutions for the

TABLE 25

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND F-VALUES OBTAINED BETWEEN PAIRS OF MEANS FOR ALL PAIRINGS OF THE FIVE CHRONOLOGICAL AGE GROUPS ON LOYALTY MEASURED BY THE IMPERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT

Group	$\overline{X}$	SD	F
CA-12 CA-13	6.56 6.55	2.56 2.16	.00
CA-12 CA-14	6.56 5.38	2.56 1.36	2.31
CA-12 CA-15	6.56 4.80	2.56 1.52	4.51*
CA-12 CA-16	6.56 4.29	2.56 1.98	3.75
CA-13 CA-14	6.55 5.38	2.16 1.36	3.00
CA-13 CA-15	6.55 4.80	2.16 1.52	5.86*
CA-13 CA-16	6.55 4.29	2.16 1.98	4.98*
CA-14 CA-15	5.38 4.80	1.36 1.52	1.23
CA-14 CA-16	5.38 4.29	1.36 1.98	2.37
CA-15 CA-16	4.80 4.29	1.52 1.98	.45

*$p < .05$, two-tailed test.

mentally retarded. Five TIR groups, defined in Chapter III, were formed from the Total Sample. These five groups were established on the basis of TIR which extended over a five year period.

Means were calculated for value-belief scores obtained on the Personal VEMS instrument for the five TIR groups. These means are shown in Table 26. Shown also are the means for the Total Sample and the Ninth Grade normative group.

Among the seven values measured, Conformity was given the lowest mean score by all groups. The highest mean score was given Honesty by the TIR-1, TIR-4, TIR-5, Total Sample, and Ninth Grade groups. Truthfulness was given the highest mean by TIR-2 and TIR-3.

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Personal VEMS Test for the Five TIR Groups

To determine differences among the TIR groups on each value measured, analyses of variance were computed. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 27.

TABLE 26

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OBTAINED WITH THE PERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT FOR FIVE TIME-IN-RESIDENCE GROUPS AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE FROM TWO NEW YORK STATE SCHOOLS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED WITH NINTH GRADE BOYS FROM CENTRAL NEW YORK SUBURBAN SCHOOLS

		TIR-1 $\bar{X}$ TIR=6.65 (N=26)	TIR-2 $\bar{X}$ TIR=18.43 (N=7)	TIR-3 $\bar{X}$ TIR=28.38 (N=8)	TIR-4 $\bar{X}$ TIR=42.83 (N=12)	TIR-5 $\bar{X}$ TIR=53.40 (N=5)	Total Sample $\bar{X}$ TIR=22.59 (N=58)	Ninth Grade Boys (N=108)
Loyalty	$\bar{X}$	2.81	2.71	2.25	2.25	2.40	2.57	2.86
	SD	1.39	1.25	1.04	0.75	0.55	1.16	1.30
Honesty	$\bar{X}$	4.04	3.71	3.63	4.42	4.60	4.07	3.47
	SD	1.31	0.95	0.74	0.90	1.14	1.12	1.33
Truthfulness	$\bar{X}$	3.42	4.00	4.25	4.25	3.80	3.81	3.11
	SD	0.95	0.82	1.04	1.36	1.30	1.10	1.07
Kindness	$\bar{X}$	2.81	2.71	3.25	3.17	2.60	2.91	3.43
	SD	1.33	1.50	0.71	1.12	0.89	1.19	0.89
Generosity	$\bar{X}$	3.23	3.43	2.75	2.92	3.80	3.17	3.33
	SD	1.11	1.13	0.89	1.56	1.09	1.19	1.47
Conformity	$\bar{X}$	1.31	1.57	1.50	1.17	1.00	1.31	1.45
	SD	1.01	1.40	1.51	1.03	1.23	1.13	1.53
Impunitiveness	$\bar{X}$	3.39	2.86	3.25	2.83	2.80	3.14	3.15
	SD	0.90	1.07	1.49	1.19	0.45	1.05	1.15

TABLE 27

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND F-VALUES OBTAINED WITH THE PERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT FOR THE FIVE TIME-IN-RESIDENCE GROUPS

	Group	$\bar{X}$	SD	F
Loyalty	TIR-1	2.81	1.39	0.70
	TIR-2	2.71	1.25	
	TIR-3	2.25	1.04	
	TIR-4	2.25	0.75	
	TIR-5	2.40	0.55	
Honesty	TIR-1	4.04	1.31	1.07
	TIR-2	3.71	0.95	
	TIR-3	3.63	0.74	
	TIR-4	4.42	0.90	
	TIR-5	4.60	1.14	
Truthfulness	TIR-1	3.42	0.95	1.75
	TIR-2	4.00	0.82	
	TIR-3	4.25	1.04	
	TIR-4	4.25	1.36	
	TIR-5	3.80	1.30	
Kindness	TIR-1	2.81	1.33	0.47
	TIR-2	2.71	1.50	
	TIR-3	3.25	0.71	
	TIR-4	3.17	1.12	
	TIR-5	2.60	0.89	
Generosity	TIR-1	3.23	1.11	0.63
	TIR-2	3.43	1.13	
	TIR-3	2.75	0.89	
	TIR-4	2.92	1.56	
	TIR-5	3.80	1.10	
Conformity	TIR-1	1.31	1.01	0.28
	TIR-2	1.57	1.40	
	TIR-3	1.50	1.51	
	TIR-4	1.17	1.03	
	TIR-5	1.00	1.23	
Impunitiveness	TIR-1	3.39	0.90	0.88
	TIR-2	2.87	1.p7	
	TIR-3	3.25	1.49	
	TIR-4	2.83	1.19	
	TIR-5	2.80	0.45	

$F_{.05}$ with 4, 53 df = 2.55, two-tailed test

No F-value was significant at the .05 level of confidence and indicated no significant differences in mean values scores among the five TIR groups.

Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for Five Time-in-Residence Groupings

Means were calculated for value-belief scores obtained on the Impersonal VEMS test for the five TIR groups. These means are shown in Table 28. Included are the means reported for 108 Ninth Grade Boys and the Total Sample.

Among the six values measured, Impunitiveness received the fourth rated mean score, Loyalty received the fifth rated mean score, and Conformity received the lowest mean score from all the groups shown.

Kindness-Generosity was given the highest mean score by TIR-1 and TIR-2. Truthfulness was given the highest mean score by TIR-3 and TIR-4. Honesty was given the highest mean score by TIR-5, the Total Sample, and the Ninth Grade group.

TABLE 28

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OBTAINED WITH THE IMPERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT FOR FIVE TIME-IN-RESIDENT GROUPS AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE FROM TWO NEW YORK STATE SCHOOLS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND FOR NINTH GRADE BOYS FROM CENTRAL NEW YORK SUBURBAN SCHOOLS

	TIR-1 $\overline{X}$ TIR=6.65 (N=26)	TIR-2 $\overline{X}$ TIR=18.43 (N=7)	TIR-3 $\overline{X}$ TIR=28.38 (N=8)	TIR-4 $\overline{X}$ TIR=42.83 (N=12)	TIR-5 $\overline{X}$ TIR=53.40 (N=5)	Total Sample $\overline{X}$ TIR=22.59 (N=58)	Ninth Grade Boys (N=108)
Loyalty	$\overline{X}$ 5.96 SD 2.13	$\overline{X}$ 4.86 SD 2.04	$\overline{X}$ 4.88 SD 1.73	$\overline{X}$ 5.25 SD 1.91	$\overline{X}$ 5.60 SD 1.67	$\overline{X}$ 5.50 SD 1.98	$\overline{X}$ 5.34 SD 2.05
Honesty	$\overline{X}$ 9.58 SD 2.19	$\overline{X}$ 9.14 SD 1.68	$\overline{X}$ 9.38 SD 2.26	$\overline{X}$ 9.58 SD 2.50	$\overline{X}$ 11.60 SD 2.30	$\overline{X}$ 9.67 SD 2.24	$\overline{X}$ 9.67 SD 2.13
Truthfulness	$\overline{X}$ 8.62 SD 2.26	$\overline{X}$ 9.71 SD 1.70	$\overline{X}$ 10.38 SD 2.39	$\overline{X}$ 9.75 SD 1.36	$\overline{X}$ 9.00 SD 2.00	$\overline{X}$ 9.26 SD 2.08	$\overline{X}$ 9.64 SD 1.96
Kindness-Generosity	$\overline{X}$ 9.73 SD 1.46	$\overline{X}$ 10.00 SD 2.31	$\overline{X}$ 8.88 SD 1.96	$\overline{X}$ 9.00 SD 2.13	$\overline{X}$ 10.40 SD 1.14	$\overline{X}$ 9.55 SD 1.78	$\overline{X}$ 9.52 SD 1.74
Conformity	$\overline{X}$ 3.58 SD 2.25	$\overline{X}$ 3.71 SD 1.50	$\overline{X}$ 4.38 SD 3.46	$\overline{X}$ 3.58 SD 2.15	$\overline{X}$ 1.60 SD 1.34	$\overline{X}$ 3.53 SD 2.32	$\overline{X}$ 2.17 SD 1.78
Impunitiveness	$\overline{X}$ 7.58 SD 1.79	$\overline{X}$ 7.57 SD 2.76	$\overline{X}$ 7.13 SD 2.85	$\overline{X}$ 7.83 SD 2.55	$\overline{X}$ 6.80 SD 1.92	$\overline{X}$ 7.50 SD 2.19	$\overline{X}$ 8.60 SD 1.56

Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained on the Impersonal VEMS Test for the Five TIR Groups

To determine differences among the TIR groups on each value measured, an analysis of variance was computed. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 29.

No F-value was significant ($p>.05$) and indicates no significant differences in mean values scores among the five TIR groups.

Summary

Comparisons of mean value-belief scores from the five TIR groups show no significant differences among the groups. TIR groups did not differ significantly from each other in the emphasis placed upon the separate values.

The visual inspection of means shows differences in value rankings. Of note are the differences in ranking of Honesty, Truthfulness, and Kindness-Generosity on the Impersonal VEMS test.

All TIR groups, the Total Sample, and the Ninth Grade normative group present different value hierarchies on the Personal VEMS instrument.

TABLE 29

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND F-VALUES OBTAINED WITH THE IMPERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENT FOR THE FIVE TIME-IN-RESIDENCE GROUPS

	Group	$\overline{X}$	SD	F
Loyalty	TIR-1	5.96	2.13	0.78
	TIR-2	4.86	2.04	
	TIR-3	4.88	1.73	
	TIR-4	5.25	1.91	
	TIR-5	5.60	1.67	
Honesty	TIR-1	9.58	2.19	1.09
	TIR-2	9.14	1.68	
	TIR-3	9.38	2.26	
	TIR-4	9.58	2.50	
	TIR-5	11.60	2.30	
Truthfulness	TIR-1	8.62	2.26	1.52
	TIR-2	9.71	1.70	
	TIR-3	10.38	2.39	
	TIR-4	9.75	1.36	
	TIR-5	9.00	2.00	
Kindness-Generosity	TIR-1	9.73	1.46	1.04
	TIR-2	10.00	2.31	
	TIR-3	8.88	1.96	
	TIR-4	9.00	2.13	
	TIR-5	10.40	1.14	
Conformity	TIR-1	3.58	2.25	1.16
	TIR-2	3.71	1.50	
	TIR-3	4.38	3.46	
	TIR-4	3.58	2.15	
	TIR-5	1.60	1.34	
Impunitiveness	TIR-1	7.58	1.79	0.25
	TIR-2	7.57	2.76	
	TIR-3	7.13	2.85	
	TIR-4	7.83	2.55	
	TIR-5	6.80	1.92	

$F_{.05}$ with 4, 53 df = 2.55, two-tailed test

Relationship Between Time-in-Residence And Value-Belief Scores

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed between value-belief scores on the Personal VEMS and Impersonal VEMS instruments and time-in-residence (TIR) scores for the Total Sample and the five TIR groups. This step was undertaken to determine the relationship between time-in-residence and value-beliefs of the EMR, delinquent subjects. The coefficients obtained are shown in Table 30.

Significance levels were established here and for all correlation coefficients reported according to the method described by Guilford.[1] The possibility of curvilinearity was examined and rejected for each correlation through the visual inspection of plots on a scatter diagram.

Relationship Between Time-in-Residence and Value-Belief Scores for the Total Sample

A visual inspection of plots indicated what appeared to be a straight line correlation between TIR and value-belief scores for the 13 value areas measured for the Total Sample by the two tests of values.

---

[1] J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1942), pp. 198-219, Table D, Appendix.

TABLE 30

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN VALUE-BELIEF SCORES AND TIR FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE AND FIVE TIR GROUPS

		Personal VEMS Scores							Impersonal VEMS Scores					
		L	H	T	K	G	C	I	L	H	T	KG	C	I
Total		-.18	.15	.20	.09	-.03	-.06	-.19	-.14	.19	.17	-.09	-.12	-.04
TIR-1	TIR	-.06	.07	-.03	.15	.10	-.25	-.06	.02	.15	-.13	.09	.12	-.29
TIR-2		.84*	-.57	.08	-.18	-.13	-.37	.34	-.44	-.02	.74	-.43	-.05	.27
TIR-3		.33	-.75*	-.22	-.77*	.62	-.29	.50	-.22	.28	-.38	-.19	-.17	.56
TIR-4		-.27	.34	-.62*	.37	-.45	.59*	.35	.01	.38	.11	-.18	-.14	-.17
TIR-5		.88*	-.11	-.70	.12	-.25	.91*	-.86	-.71	.76	-.61	-.91*	-.14	.98*

*$p < .05$, two-tailed test.

Total	df = 56	$r_{.05}$ = .26
TIR-1	df = 24	$r_{.05}$ = .39
TIR-2	df = 5	$r_{.05}$ = .75
TIR-3	df = 6	$r_{.05}$ = .71
TIR-4	df = 10	$r_{.05}$ = .58
TIR-5	df = 3	$r_{.05}$ = .88

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients shown in Table 30 indicate 8 negative and 5 positive correlations. For the 13 values measured, no relationship is significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The results of these methods of assessing relationships between value-beliefs and TIR suggest that while there is a relationship between these variables it is of relatively low order and not significant.

Relationship Between Time-in-Residence and Value-Belief Scores for the Five TIR Groups

A further analysis of the data was undertaken in an attempt to determine possible influences attributed to a specific time period of residence. Five groups, incorporating all subjects, were established on the basis of time-in-residence. Each subject was assigned to a TIR group depending upon his length of stay at the institution expressed in months. Figure 2 illustrates this assignment.

Correlation coefficients were computed between value-belief scores on the *Personal VEMS* and *Impersonal VEMS* tests and time-in-residence scores for the five TIR

Group	TIR-1	TIR-2	TIR-3	TIR-4	TIR-5
TIR (months)	1-12	13-24	25-36	37-48	49-60
RSS Ss	8	5	2	1	0
SSS Ss	18	2	6	11	5
Total Ss	26	7	8	12	5

(N = 58)

Fig. 2. Time-in-residence (TIR) group assignments.

groups. The coefficients shown in Table 30 depict a significant relationship between TIR and value area scores in *7* instances on the *Personal VEMS* test and in *2* instances on the *Impersonal VEMS* test. A total of *9* of *65* coefficients are significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Personal VEMS

1. A significant relationship exists between TIR and *Loyalty* for TIR-2 and TIR-5. The coefficients are .84 and .88, respectively.
2. A significant relationship exists between TIR and *Honesty* for TIR-3. The coefficient is -.75.
3. A significant relationship exists between TIR and *Truthfulness* for TIR-4. The coefficient is -.62.

4. A significant relationship exists between TIR and *Kindness* for TIR-3. The coefficient is -.77.

5. A significant relationship exists between TIR and *Conformity* for TIR-4 and TIR-5. These coefficients are .59 and .91, respectively.

6. A non-significant relationship exists between TIR and *Generosity* and *Impunitiveness* for all groups.

Impersonal VEMS

1. A significant relationship exists between TIR and *Kindness-Generosity* for TIR-5. The coefficient is -.91.

2. A significant relationship exists between TIR and *Impunitiveness* for TIR-5. The coefficient is .98.

3. A non-significant relationship exists between TIR and *Loyalty*, *Honesty*, *Truthfulness*, and *Conformity* for all groups.

One major hypothesis and *seven* sub-hypotheses were proposed. The findings relevant to these hypotheses are discussed below.

> H_1: There will be significant differences in the value-beliefs of institutionalized, delinquent, educable mentally retarded, adolescent males related to time-in-residence.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients computed between time-in-residence and value scores for the Total Sample failed to yield a significant relationship. For the 13 values measured, no coefficient was significant at the .05 level of confidence. The result of this method of assessing relationships between value-beliefs and an institution experience suggests that while there seemed to be a relationship between the variables it was of relatively low order and not significant.

A further analysis of the data was undertaken in an attempt to determine possible influences attributed to a specific time period in residence. Correlation coefficients computed between TIR and value-belief scores for the 5 TIR groups indicated a significant relationship in _7_ instances on the _Personal_ _VEMS_ test and in _2_ instances on the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ test.

A total of _9_ of _78_ coefficients were significant for the 5 TIR groups and Total Sample combined. Although

9 significant correlations were found, they failed to follow any predictable or logical order.

The analysis of variance was applied to compare mean scores of the 5 TIR groups on each of the 13 values measured. This was undertaken to determine which of the differences between means were significant and which were not. The analysis provided no significant F-value at the .05 level of confidence and indicated that no significant differences in mean value scores existed among the 5 TIR groups.

F-values indicating differences in value scores among the 5 TIR groups to be non-significant coupled with the over-all low order relationship between TIR and the 13 value scores appear to indicate that observed differences are due to chance.

The combined results lead to a rejection of the hypothesis that there will be significant differences in the value-beliefs of institutionalized, delinquent, educable mentally retarded, adolescent males related to time-in-residence.

H_{1a}: Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become more conforming. (As time-in-residence increases, conformity scores will increase.)

For the total sample, the correlation coefficient obtained between time-in-residence and *Conformity* scores on the *Personal* *VEMS* was -.06. The coefficients obtained between these two variables for the TIR-1, TIR-2, and TIR-3 groups were -.25, -.37, and -.29, respectively. In these four instances the relationship is negative and non-significant.

The coefficients obtained for the TIR-4 and TIR-5 groups were .59 and .91, respectively. These two coefficients indicate a positive and significant relationship between time-in-residence and *Conformity* scores for the two groups longest in residence.

The analysis of variance, on the other hand, produced a non-significant F-value of .28 which indicates no significant differences in mean *Conformity* scores among the 5 TIR groups. An inspection of mean scores shows the TIR-4 and TIR-5 groups (the two groups longest in residence) to have the lowest mean scores on *Conformity*.

Similarly, for all groups analyzed, whether grouped by chronological age, race, or institution of residence, Conformity scores are lowest in the 7 value areas measured by the Personal VEMS instrument.

On the Impersonal VEMS, the correlation coefficient obtained between time-in-residence and Conformity scores was -.12 for the total sample; .12 for the TIR-1 group; -.05 for the TIR-2 group; -.17 for TIR-3; -.14 for TIR-4; and -.14 for TIR-5. In all instances, the coefficients indicate a non-significant relationship between time-in-residence and Conformity. Except for the TIR-1 group, all other coefficients indicate a negative relationship between time-in-residence and the Conformity variable.

The analysis of variance produced an F-value of 1.16, indicating a non-significant difference in mean scores on Conformity among the 5 TIR groups.

For all groups analyzed, Conformity scores are lowest in the 6 value areas measured by the Impersonal VEMS test.

The results of these analyses suggest that the institutionalized group places Conformity lowest of all values measured and, throughout the 5 year period surveyed, tends to regard Conformity of least importance.

F-values indicating differences in Conformity scores among the 5 TIR groups to be non-significant coupled with the low order relationship between TIR and Conformity scores appear to indicate that observed differences were due to chance.

The combined results lead to a rejection of the hypothesis that subjects would become more conforming as a result of institution living.

> H_{1b}: Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become more impunitive. (As time-in-residence increases, impunitiveness scores will increase.)

For the total sample, the correlation coefficient obtained between time-in-residence and Impunitiveness scores on the Personal VEMS was -.19. The correlation between these two variables for TIR-1 was -.06; for TIR-2, .34; for TIR-3, .50; .35 for TIR-4; and -.86 for TIR-5. In 3 of the 6 instances the relationship is negative and in the other *3*, positive.

For neither the total sample nor for the 5 TIR groupings is the correlation coefficient significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The analysis of variance produced a non-significant F-value of .88 which indicates that differences in mean *Impunitiveness* scores among the 5 TIR groups are not significant. An inspection of mean scores show the TIR-4 and TIR-5 groups (the two groups longest in residence) to have the lowest mean scores on *Impunitiveness* for all groupings analyzed and measured on the *Personal* *VEMS*.

On the *Impersonal* *VEMS*, the correlation coefficient obtained between time-in-residence and *Impunitiveness* scores was -.04 for the total sample. This negative coefficient indicates a non-significant relationship between the two variables.

The product moment coefficient for the TIR-1 group was -.29; .27 for TIR-2; .56 for TIR-3; and -.17 for TIR-4. In these instances the relationship between time-in-residence and *Impunitiveness* scores is statistically non-significant.

The coefficient obtained, however, for the TIR-5 group was .98. The relationship for this group is positive and highly significant.

At the same time, an analysis of variance produced an F-value of .25 and indicated that mean score differences among the 5 TIR groups were not significant. An inspection of mean scores also shows the TIR-5 group to have the lowest mean score on *Impunitiveness* when compared with other TIR groups, the total sample, and all other groupings established on CA, race, and institution of residence.

F-values indicating differences in *Impunitiveness* scores among the 5 TIR groups to be non-significant coupled with the low order relationship between TIR and *Impunitiveness* scores appear to indicate that observed differences are due to chance.

The results of these analyses lead to a rejection of the hypothesis that subjects would become more impunitive.

H_{1c}: Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become more truthful. (As time-in-residence increases, truthfulness scores will increase.)

For the total sample, the correlation coefficient obtained between time-in-residence and *Truthfulness* scores on the Personal *VEMS* was .20. Coefficients obtained for the TIR-1 group was -.03; .08 for TIR-2; -.22 for TIR-3; -.62 for TIR-4; and -.70 for TIR-5. Significance was reached for the TIR-4 group where the other coefficients are not significant.

Four of the *6* *r*'s are of negative sign and *2* are positive. This indicates that as time-in-residence increases, *Truthfulness* scores decrease within 4 groupings. As a total sample, however, the correlation is positive though not significant.

An analysis of variance on *Truthfulness* provided a non-significant F-value of 1.75. This analysis indicated that differences in mean scores among the 5 TIR groups were not significant. An inspection of means, on the other hand, shows that, with the exception of TIR-5, *Truthfulness* means tend to increase for the TIR groupings.

With the exception of the TIR-1 group, mean scores on _Truthfulness_ for the TIR groups are equal to or greater than the RSS, SSS-A, WHITE, Total Sample, CA-12, CA-13, and CA-14 groups. Only the CA-15 and CA-16 groups received means on _Truthfulness_ greater than the highest TIR group means.

On the _Impersonal VIMS_, the correlation coefficient obtained between time-in-residence and _Truthfulness_ was .17. The coefficient for TIR-1 was -.13; .74 for TIR-2; -.38 for TIR-3; .11 for TIR-4; and -.61 for TIR-5.

Three of the _6_ coefficients are negative and _3_ are positive. None is significant at the .05 level of confidence.

An analysis of variance on _Truthfulness_ provided a non-significant F-value of 1.52 indicating that differences in mean scores among the 5 TIR groups were not significant.

An inspection of means, however, shows that mean scores increase for the first 3 TIR groups and decrease for the last 2 TIR groups. Correlation coefficients seem to indicate that within the TIR groups, there is a tendency toward a reduction in _Truthfulness_ scores.

For the total sample, Truthfulness scores on both the Personal and Impersonal instruments tend to increase as time-in-residence increases. This relationship is positive but is of low order and not significant.

The assignment of the sample to TIR groups, however, shows mean scores to increase for the first 3 years in residence and then gradually decrease for the last 2 years surveyed. The evidence seems to suggest that the institution experiences tend to develop a strong feeling toward Truthfulness, but this gain is reduced after a longer period in residence.

It is noted that mean scores on Truthfulness for the 5 CA groups tend to increase as CA increases. This is more noticeable on the Impersonal VEMS instrument. It seems possible that increases in Truthfulness scores may be more a function of CA than TIR.

F-values indicating differences in Truthfulness scores among the 5 TIR groups to be non-significant coupled with the low order relationship between TIR and Truthfulness scores appear to indicate that observed differences in scores are due to chance.

The evidence obtained through this study does not appear strong enough to accept the hypothesis that as time-in-residence increases, Truthfulness increases. The hypothesis, therefore, was rejected.

> H_1d: Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, LMR, adolescent males will become less loyal. (As time-in-residence increases, loyalty scores will decrease.)

For the total sample, the correlation coefficient obtained between time-in-residence and Loyalty scores on the Personal VEMS test was -.18. The correlation coefficient between these two variables was -.06 for the TIR-1 group; .84 for TIR-2; .33 for TIR-3; -.27 for TIR-4; and .88 for TIR-5. The coefficients for TIR-2 (.84) and TIR-t (.88) are significant at the .05 level of confidence. The others are not significant.

An inspection of mean scores for Loyalty shown in Table 27 seems to indicate that as time-in-residence increases, Loyalty scores decrease until the fifth, or last year, surveyed. At that point, the mean score increased for the TIR-5 group.

The analysis of variance on Loyalty provided a non-significant F-value of .70. This analysis indicated that differences in mean scores among the 5 TIR groups were not significant. This would appear to indicate that any decrease would not be significant.

On the Impersonal VEMS, the correlation between time-in-residence and Loyalty scores was -.14 for the total sample. For the TIR-1 group the coefficient was .02; -.44 for TIR-2; -.22 for TIR-3; .01 for TIR-4; and -.71 for TIR-5. None is significant at the .05 level of confidence. The relationship, in general, appears to be negative.

The analysis of variance on Loyalty as measured by the Impersonal VEMS provided a non-significant F-value of .78. This analysis indicated that differences in mean scores among the 5 TIR groups were not significant on the Loyalty variable. An inspection of means shows that with the exception of the TIR-1 group, Loyalty scores gradually increase. This increase, nonetheless, does not approach the initial mean obtained for the TIR-1 group.

F-values indicating differences in Loyalty scores among the five TIR groups to be non-significant coupled with the low order relationship between TIR and Loyalty scores lead to the rejection of the hypothesis that loyalty scores would increase with time spent in residence.

> H_{1e}: Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become less kind. (As time-in-residence increases, kindness scores will decrease.)

The correlation coefficient obtained between time-in-residence and Kindness scores on the Personal VEMS was .09 for the total sample. For the TIR-1 group the correlation coefficient was .15; .37 for TIR-4; and .12 for TIR-5. In these four instances the relationship is positive and not significant.

For the TIR-2 group the coefficient was -.18 indicating a negative and not significant relationship between the two variables under consideration.

For the TIR-3 group, on the other hand, the coefficient -.77 is significant at the .05 level and indicates a negative relationship between time-in-residence and Kindness scores.

The analysis of variance produced a non-significant F-value of .47 and indicated no significant differences in mean Kindness scores among the 5 TIR groups.

An inspection of the mean scores shown in Table 27 does not reveal any observable trends. It does show, however, that the largest mean score was obtained by the TIR-3 group. This seems inconsistent with the significant -.77 coefficient which indicated a strong negative relationship between time-in-residence and Kindness scores for this TIR group.

For the total sample, the correlation coefficient obtained between time-in-residence and Impersonal VEMS Kindness-Generosity scores was -.09. The coefficients obtained between these two variables for the TIR-2, TIR-3, TIR-4, TIR-5 groups were -.43, -.19, -.18, and -.91, respectively. Among them, only the -.91 obtained for the TIR-5 group is significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The TIR-1 group obtained the single positive correlation coefficient which was .09. Except for this grouping, the coefficients indicate a negative relationship between time-in-residence and Kindness-Generosity scores.

The analysis of variance produced a non-significant F-value of 1.04. This resulted in establishing a non-significant difference in mean scores on Kindness-Generosity among the 5 TIR groups.

An inspection of mean scores shows an increase for the first two groups, a decrease for the TIR-3 group, and a gradual increase to the TIR-5 group which obtained the highest mean score among the 5 TIR groups.

The TIR-5 mean score seems to be inconsistent with the significant -.91 coefficient which indicates a strong negative relationship between time-in-residence and Kindness scores.

The evidence obtained through this investigation does not appear strong enough to accept the hypothesis that as time-in-residence increases, Kindness scores will decrease.

H_1f: Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become less

> generous. (As time-in-residence increases, generosity scores will decrease.)

For the total sample, the correlation coefficient obtained between time-in-residence and Generosity scores on the Personal VEMS was -.03. The coefficients for TIR-2, TIR-4, and TIR-5 were -.13, -.45, and -.25, respectively. In these four instances the relationships are negative and not significant.

For the TIR-1 and TIR-3 groups, the coefficients were .10 and .62, respectively. These coefficients are positive and not significant.

The analysis of variance produced a non-significant F-value of .83 which indicated that no significant differences existed in mean Generosity scores among the five TIR groups.

An inspection of mean scores shown in Table 27 shows a slight rise in mean score for the second year group, a reduction in mean score for the third year group, and a rise for the fourth and fifth year groups. The TIR-3 group has the lowest mean, and the TIR-5 group has the largest mean. The TIR-3 group with the lowest mean score on Generosity showed the strongest positive relationship between TIR and value scores.

On the Impersonal VEMS, the correlation coefficient produced between TIR and Kindness-Generosity scores for the Total Sample was -.09. The coefficients obtained between the two variables for the TIR-2, TIR-3, TIR-4, and TIR-5 groups were -.43, -.19, -.18, and -.91, respectively. Among them only the -.91 obtained for the TIR-5 group is significant at the .05 level.

The single positive coefficient, .09, was obtained for the TIR-1 group. Except for this grouping, the coefficients indicated a negative relationship between time-in-residence and Kindness-Generosity scores.

An analysis of variance produced a non-significant F-value of 1.04 among the mean scores for the five TIR groups. Therefore there is no significance in differences between mean scores on Kindness-Generosity on the Impersonal VEMS measure.

An inspection of mean scores shows an increase for the first two groups, a decrease for the TIR-3 group, and a gradual increase to the TIR-5 group which provided the highest mean score among the five TIR groups. The TIR-5 mean seems to be inconsistent with the significant -.91 coefficient indicating a strong negative relationship between TIR and Kindness-Generosity scores.

Generosity scores obtained on the Personal VEMS and Kindness-Generosity scores obtained on the Impersonal VEMS appear to lack consistency among the aggregate of means secured for the five TIR groups. The evidence does not seem to lend itself to acceptance of the hypothesis that as time-in-residence increases, Generosity beliefs will decrease.

F-values indicating differences in Generosity scores on the Personal VEMS and Kindness-Generosity scores on the Impersonal VEMS among the five TIR groups, coupled with the low order and non-significant relationship between TIR and Generosity and Kindness-Generosity scores, lead to the acceptance of a hypothesis that observed differences in Generosity were due to chance.

> H_{1g}: Over time, institutionalized, delinquent, EMR, adolescent males will become less honest. (As time-in-residence increases, honesty scores will decrease.)

For the Total Sample, the correlation coefficient obtained between time-in-residence and Honesty scores on the Personal VEMS test was .15. This coefficient was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. The coefficients obtained between these variables for the TIR-1 and TIR-4 groups were .07 and .34, respectively. These coefficients were positive and not significant.

Negative coefficients were obtained for the TIR-2, TIR-3, and TIR-5 groups. These were -.57, -.75, and -.11, respectively. Only the -.75 for the TIR-3 group was significant.

The analysis of variance produced a non-significant F-value of 1.07 and established a non-significant difference for mean scores on Honesty among the five TIR groups.

An inspection of mean scores shows the TIR-4 and TIR-5 groups to have the highest mean scores on _Honesty_. The lowest mean score was held by the TIR-3 (third year) group, however. Neither an upward or downward trend is discernible through this informal inspection.

On the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ test, the coefficient between TIR and _Honesty_ scores for the Total Sample was .19. This coefficient was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The coefficients obtained between time-in-residence and _Honesty_ scores for the TIR-1, TIR-3, TIR-4, and TIR-5 groups were .15, .28, .38, and .76, respectively. None of these positive correlation coefficients is significant.

The TIR-2 group provided the sole negative coefficient of -.02 which is also non-significant.

An analysis of variance on _Honesty_ measured by the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ scale provided a non-significant F-value of 1.09. This indicated that differences in mean scores among the five TIR groups were not significant.

An informal inspection of mean scores shows that the TIR-5 group obtained the largest mean score on Honesty. The means for the TIR-1 and TIR-4 groups, however, are identical and second highest.

F-values indicating differences in Honesty scores on the two scales among the five TIR groups to be non-significant, coupled with the low order and non-significant relationship between Honesty scores and TIR, lead to the acceptance of a hypothesis that observed differences in honesty scores were due to chance.

The evidence seems to warrant the rejection of the hypothesis that as time-in-residence increases the subjects will become less honest.

Summary

One major hypothesis and seven sub-hypotheses were proposed. The major hypothesis that there would be significant differences in the value-beliefs of institutionalized,delinquent, educable mentally retarded, adolescent males related to time-in-residence was rejected.

The seven sub-hypotheses related to time-in-residence and changes in specific value-beliefs were rejected.

For the eight hypotheses, rejection was in favor of a hypothesis that observed differences were due to chance.

It is again noted that hypothesized direction of change in sub-hypotheses H_{1a} through H_{1g} was made arbitrarily by the investigator for academic purposes rather than on previous research or anticipated findings.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Summary

A review of the literature indicated a need to study the value-beliefs of institutionalized, educable mentally retarded, delinquent, adolescent males.

The need was established, in part, on two considerations. One of these was that the residential institution, acting as foster parent and assuming the child rearing responsibilities of the family, would be concerned with the values of its wards. The other was that an understanding of the value-beliefs of delinquent retardates is needed in order to develop constructive education, rehabilitation, and training curriculum at the institution level.

The review of the literature failed to uncover research dealing with the value-beliefs of educable mentally retarded delinquents or the effect of an institution experience on the values of confined persons.

The primary purpose of this investigation was to study the relationship between time-in-residence and value-beliefs.

Time-in-residence was determined by length of stay at a residential institution expressed in months. Time-in-residence for the subjects selected ranged from 1 through 60 months.

Value-beliefs were measured on two instruments. These were the *Personal VEMS* and *Impersonal VEMS*[1] tests developed by Gardner and Thompson.[2] Each test is designed to measure selected ethical, moral, and social values judged to be important in the interpersonal relationships of adolescent boys.

Boys with chronological ages from 12-0 through 16-6 years of age were selected for study.

Intellectual retardation was considered from two aspects. The rate of intellectual functioning or development was measured on an individually administered intelligence test (WISC or *Stanford Binet*). Intelligence test scores, expressed as intelligence quotients, were taken from records and reports on the institutions' psychologist staff. These scores ranged from _50_ through _79_.

---

[1] VEMS is an abbreviation for Values: Ethical, Moral and Social.

[2] Eric Gardner and Thompson, *op. cit*.

Another consideration of intellectual retardation was based on etiological classification. Individuals with a family background and history of sub-average intellectual functioning and without history or suspicion of brain-injury were selected. The boys studied were classified by the institutions' medical staff as Familial, Cultural-familial, or Undifferentiated.

Socio-economic level was determined by an application of criteria from the Warner, Meeker and Eells' _Index of Status Characteristics_.[1] Boys of lower-class status were selected.

Delinquency was determined from recorded participation in delinquent activities prior to institution placement. Delinquent acts were those considered illegal for juveniles by New York State statute.[2]

Medical records were scanned for an indication or diagnosis of emotional instability. Excluded from selection were subjects diagnosed as neurotic, psychotic, schizophrenic, manic-depressive, epileptic, and/or organic brain-injured.

---

[1] Warner, Meeker, and Eells, _op_. _cit_.

[2] _McKinney's Consolidated Laws of New York_.

As a group, the boys selected for study were seen as functioning within a particular environmental situation. This environment was established as the residential institution. No attempt, however, was made to characterize the institution setting or its environmental press.

The Total Sample of 58 boys meeting selection criteria were grouped for analysis as a total sample. Subgroupings were also analyzed for information concerning institution of residence, race, chronological age (CA), and time-in-residence (TIR).

Two groups were formed on institution of residence. Negro and white subjects were considered separately. On the basis of CA, 5 groups were defined to cover the 5 year age span. Five groups were defined on the basis of TIR which extended over a 5 year period.

Means were calculated for value-belief scores obtained on the Personal VEMS and Impersonal VEMS instruments for the total sample and its divisions into groups established on institution of residence, race, CA, and TIR.

Comparisons made between residential groups and between racial groups revealed few differences in mean value-beliefs measured on the Personal VEMS test.

Significant differences in emphasis on Loyalty were found between the Rome State School group of white subjects and the Syracuse State School Negroes, and between the combined Rome and Syracuse State Schools' white subjects and the Syracuse State School Negroes. In the two comparisons of Negro and white subjects, the Negro mean Loyalty score was lower than that of the white groupings.

Comparisons made between residential groups and between racial groups revealed no differences in mean value-beliefs measured on the Impersonal VEMS instrument. These groupings within the total sample did not differ significantly from each other in the emphasis placed on the separate values.

Comparisons made between CA groups revealed significant differences between CA groups on Truthfulness and Conformity measured on the Personal VEMS. On Truthfulness, significant differences were found between the CA-13 and CA-15 group; between the CA-13 and CA-16 groups; and between the CA-14 and CA-15 groups. On Conformity, significant differences were found between the CA-12 and CA-15 groups; between the CA-12 and CA-16 groups; between the CA-13 and CA-14 groups; between the CA-14 and CA-15 groups; and between the CA-14 and CA-16 groups.

Comparisons made between CA groups revealed a significant difference on Loyalty measured by the Impersonal VEMS test for three pairings. Significant differences were found for scores between the CA-12 and CA-15 groups, the CA-13 and CA-15 groups, and the CA-13 and CA-16 groups.

Comparisons made between time-in-residence groups revealed no significant differences in mean values measured on the Personal VEMS or Impersonal VEMS instruments.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated between value scores on the two instruments and time-in-residence for the total sample and five TIR groups. This step was undertaken to determine the relationships between time-in-residence and the value-belief scores.

A visual inspection of plots on a scatter diagram indicated what appeared to be a straight line correlation between time-in-residence and value scores.

Correlation coefficients derived between TIR and the 13 values measured were not significant at the .05 level of confidence for the total sample. Coefficients between TIR and values for the 5 TIR groups revealed a significant relationship between the variables in _7_ instances on the _Personal_ _VEMS_ test and in _2_ instances on the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ test. A total of _9_ of _65_ correlation coefficients was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

One major hypothesis and seven sub-hypotheses were proposed. The major hypothesis that there would be significant differences in the value-beliefs of institutionalized, delinquent, educable mentally retarded, adolescent males related to time-in-residence was rejected. The seven sub-hypotheses related to time-in-residence and changes in specific value-beliefs were rejected. For the eight hypotheses, rejection was in favor of the hypothesis that observed change in value-beliefs were due to chance.

Discussion

This study was concerned with whether social interaction over a period of time within an institution setting would influence members of a specific group toward certain value-belief preferences.

The findings which indicate no significant relationship between time-in-residence and values of the group studied could be interpreted as indicating that the institution is not focusing its attention toward developing value-beliefs of its wards. The evidence seems to suggest that there is relatively little emphasis on teaching the values measured by the Gardner-Thompson scales.

This interpretation, however, should not be construed as indicating laxity, negligence, or irresponsibility on the part of the residential institution. As Borrowman[1] points out, ". . . only in a group which is isolated from alien influences and in which considerable ideological homogeneity prevails might strong preferences occur."

It will be recognized that the residential facilities at Rome and Syracuse are "open" institutions and do not appear to be isolated from community activities. Both institutions allow visitors and conduct tours and seminars for community and professional groups. In addition, the Syracuse State School for several years has provided students for the Syracuse University Summer Demonstration School.

Whatever the institutions' specific orientation and goal preferences in their endeavors to train, educate, and rehabilitate educable mentally retarded, delinquent, adolescents, it seems reasonable to infer that the emphasis is on competencies other than those involving the value-beliefs measured by the Gardner-Thompson instruments.

---

[1] Merle L. Borrowman, "Traditional Values and the Shaping of American Education," Social Forces Influencing American Education, Sixtieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 144-70.

Another explanation for finding no significant relationship between time-in-residence and values is that the institution may be ineffective when teaching value-beliefs. Stephens[1] has noted that in the field of academic development, the school has almost complete control of the tasks which confront children. Academic problems may be presented in a sequential or connected series at a time and in a manner judged to be conducive to the development of students.

On the other hand, problems of personal and social adjustment and problems of value orientation confront students whether the school arranges the problems or not. The school, and the institution, may be unable to present a graded series of adjustment problems through which children progress from the easy to the more difficult. The school may be unable to regulate the presentation of an adjustment task at a time when students are best able to cope with it.

These notions on the presentation of adjustment tasks would seem to hold for value-beliefs.

Stephens[2] considers several reasons the school may be unable to effect significant gains in character develppment which seem relevant to this discussion. Among these reasons are 1) the interference of other social agencies, 2) the varying prestige of the teacher, 3) the overwhelming importance of the area of values, and 4) the teacher's concentration on academic subject matter.

---

[1] Stephens, op. cit.

[2] Ibid.

It is recognized that non-scholastic social agencies may aid, hinder, or leave the teachings of the school unaffected. The home, peer-group, and church are felt to have definite views on matters involving value-beliefs. It may be that the several identifiable groupings within the institution (the school, peer-group, chaplain, ward attendants, cottage parents, psychological and medical staff, social workers, work-program leaders, volunteer workers, and others) present divergent views in value-belief areas and counteract each other.

It will be recalled that Peters[1] notes that ". . . the combined influence of all the stimuli and responses acting upon the life of the mentally deficient . . . determines his character and personality." Peters points out that the staff and personnel of the Rome State School are conscious of their responsibility in the character development of children and are working toward a successful rehabilitation of their patients. The findings of this study which indicate no significant relationship between time-in-residence and values tend to indicate that the curriculum of the institution may not be coordinated in an emphasis on value-beliefs.

---

[1] Peters, op. cit.

Another factor which may reduce the school's influence in value-belief areas is that of teacher prestige. Teachers may not have the same prestige in the area of values as in academic areas. In academic areas, teachers are acknowledged authorities. In value areas, the residential school and staff may be challenged by other disciplines, social groupings, and significant persons within the institution complex. Others may doubt the school's opinions on how one should act or behave in selected situations outside the classroom.

Not to be overlooked is that the importance of value-belief development may overwhelm the teacher. Because of importance ascribed to values, the institution teacher may be hesitant to take command in this area. The teacher may question his competence to pass judgment on non-academic matters. He may question his ability to decide whether or not a child is developing into a good citizen with sound value-beliefs. The teacher may not want to impose his values on others.

It must also be considered that the school may concentrate on academic skills and knowledge while leaving value-beliefs to other disciplines and agencies within the institution. It may be that the school recognizes honesty and loyalty to be important but also realizes that teaching reading is the school's function. It may be felt that others within the institution, such as chaplains, cottage parents, and athletic directors, are involved in teaching value-beliefs, but if the teacher does not teach reading no one else will. If the teacher also were to concentrate on value-beliefs, academic accomplishment might be reduced or not realized during the adolescent's tenure of confinement.

Stephens[1] notes that there is little evidence to establish the relative teachability of different character traits. Among these traits are those related to honesty, truthfulness, loyalty, and others measured during the course of this investigation. Stephens states that some character traits may be less amenable to schooling.

---

[1] Stephens, op. cit.

This consideration has been noted in the literature. In 1936, Jones[1] conducted an experiment over one academic year with eight upper-grade groups. He noted small gains made in honesty in schoolwork and in cooperation procured by developing group morale. Jones reports that the gains made were lost when the children were assigned subsequently to different classrooms.

Feder and Miller[2] evaluated boys who participated for two to five years in an intensive program of club work and military training. They found that the participants did not differ significantly from boys in general on tests of health, citizenship, attitudes toward war, or on behavior ratings. Olson[3] notes that attempts through direct instruction in character development reveal small gains of "questionable durability."

---

[1] Vernon Jones, Character and Citizenship Training in the Public School (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936).

[2] D. D. Feder and L. W. Miller, "An Evaluation of Certain Aspects of a Program of Character Education," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXIV (1933), 385-91.

[3] Willard Olson, "Character Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. Walter S. Monroe (Rev.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1952), pp. 126-33.

A philosophy underlying institution placement with special education provisions for EMR delinquents seems to be based on providing needed learning experiences which cannot be realized within the community or in a regular correction or education program. Expectant is that selective placement and experiences in a special institution program leads to greater personal and social success. The possibility exists, then, that the institution's present technique, method, and state of knowledge concerning the teaching of values is ineffective for bringing about significant changes in value-belief areas.

Not to be overlooked, however, is that confinement, _per se_, may work against success. As an illustration, ". . . in teaching a child to own up to his misdoings and to take the consequences, the school may be working against a strong inherent urge to avoid unpleasantness."[1] If it were established that the mentally retarded delinquent considered institutionalization and other consequences of his past illegal behavior unpleasant, it would appear the institution would be minimally effective in making significant changes in the value-beliefs of persons confined for misbehavior in the community.

---

[1] Stephens, _op_. _cit_.

Conceded throughout this discussion is the assumption of the investigator that the institution desires and plans to effect a change in the value preferences of confined delinquents. Results of this study, however, may indicate that the effect of the program possibly should not be stated in terms of value-belief preferences.

A factor not to be ruled out is that the EMR delinquent may reject the teachings of the institution. Also possible is that the mentally retarded delinquent may be incapable of learning those values measured by the Gardner-Thompson scales.

The investigator questions whether participation in acts of juvenile delinquency provides enough evidence to support the contention that delinquency participants have deviant value-belief preferences at the time of institution placement. Testing under controls imposed by the investigator related to socio-economic background, intelligence, and etiology did not show the institutionalized delinquent to be unique in value-beliefs when compared with adolescents in the general population.

The notable difference in the delinquent retarded group as compared to the normative group was the hierarchial ranking of values. On the _Personal_ _VEMS_, the delinquent boys were found to rank _Truthfulness_ above _Kindness_ where the normative group ranked _Kindness_ above _Truthfulness_. This finding was consistent with that of Gardner and Thompson[1] who found that ". . . delinquent boys are significantly more likely than nondelinquent boys to favor truthfulness as contrasted with kindness in relationship with best friends."

On the _Impersonal_ _VEMS_ the reverse is noted. The delinquent retardates ranked _Kindness_-_Generosity_ above _Truthfulness_ where the normative group ranked _Truthfulness_ above _Kindness_-_Generosity_. Gardner and Thompson, however, found that both their delinquent and nondeliquent boys ranked _Kindness_-_Generosity_ above _Truthfulness_.

Although Gardner and Thompson found slight

---

[1] Eric Gardner and Thompson, _op_. _cit_.

PRECEDING PAGE MISSING

delinquents. The boys were asked to react to questions in regard to what they believe they "ought to do" and not to what they "would do."

Hurlock[1] remarks that knowledge of right and wrong does not guarantee behavior consistent with that knowledge. This comment is also made by Gardner and Thompson.[2] Witlow[3] reports little relationship between professed moral values and actual behavior for high school boys and girls. Others have also found discrepancy between behavior and expressed beliefs.[4]

Cohen[5] reports a lack of relationship between the employer's realistic concept of mental retardation and expressed attitude toward hiring mentally retarded persons. He states that ". . . it appears that the mere acquisition of accurate information . . . does not tend to assure an accepting attitude. . . ."

---

[1] Elizabeth Hurlock, Adolescent Development (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955), p. 330.

[2] Eric Gardner and Thompson, op. cit., chap. 16.

[3] C. M. Witlow, "Attitudes and Behavior of High-School Students," American Journal of Sociology, XL (1934), 489-94.

[4] H. H. Remmers and B. Shimberg, Purdue Opinion Poll for Young People (Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 1949).

[5] Julius S. Cohen, "Employer Attitudes Toward Hiring Mentally Retarded Individuals," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXVII, No. 5 (March, 1963), 705-13.

To explain the discrepancy between beliefs and behavior, Hurlock[1] presents the notion that peer-group pressures may bring about behavior that is not in accordance with one's moral values. Havighurst and Taba[2] express the point of view that individuals may be forced to sacrifice their beliefs for expediency or for emotional reasons. For illustration, a person who believes in friendliness may take an exception to this belief when conflicting interests are at stake or when a specific person is involved.

This study, as did Gardner and Thompson's study, failed to show any significant difference in the verbally expressed ethical and moral values of delinquents and non-delinquents. It seems more likely that the delinquent group studied differs not so much in the broad value-beliefs they hold as in the means and behavioral style by which they realize their goals.

Implications for Further Research

Comparisons made between chronological age groups revealed significant differences between several groups on value-beliefs regarding truthfulness and conformity in relationships with best friends as measured by the Personal VEMS test. It was noted that mean scores on truthfulness for the five chronological age groups tend to increase as chronological age increased. This trend was noted on both the Personal VEMS and Impersonal VEMS scales.

---

[1] Hurlock, *op. cit.*

[2] Robert J. Havighurst and Hilda Taba, *Adolescent Character and Personality* (New York: John Wiley and Son, 1949).

Conformity scores tend to go down for the chronological age groups on both scales.

A significant difference between several chronological age groups was also found on loyalty measured by the Impersonal VEMS test. A definite trend downward with increasing age could be observed.

Other researchers may find these differences in emphasis on truthfulness, conformity, and loyalty as related to chronological age an important area for subsequent research with the institutionalized, educable mentally retarded, delinquent adolescent.

Unresolved is the significant difference in emphasis on loyalty found between the Syracuse State School Negro group when compared with the combined white group. The difference was not found to be significant, however, when the Negro group was compared with white boys from the same institution.

The design of this study did not allow the differences in loyalty scores to be explained as a function of race. It was noted that the Negro group was found to be younger, in residence a shorter time, and to have higher intelligence test scores when compared with white colleagues in the same institution.

These age, time-in-residence, and intelligence test score differences were also noted when the Negro group was compared with the Rome State School group. These differences, however, may have been a function of selection control differences.

Other researchers may find the significant differences in loyalty emphasis an important area for subsequent research with institutionalized, educable mentally retarded, delinquent, adolescent Negroes.

It is recalled that delinquent behavior of educable mentally retarded adolescents has been found to be a primary factor influencing their placement in a residential institution. Unquestionably, delinquent behavior would be the primary factor influencing placement in a correctional institution. It would seem important then to investigate the effect of correctional school experience on the value-beliefs of EMR, delinquent, adolescent boys.

A comparison of the effect on value-beliefs of the two types of facilities available for placement and rehabilitation of EMR delinquents seems warranted. It would seem that the results of the comparison would help courts dealing with juvenile offenders to make a sound and more advantageous placement of the retarded delinquent.

An investigation of the effect of correctional school experience on the value-beliefs of EMR delinquents might be coupled with a comparison of the effect of correctional school experience on the value-beliefs of gifted delinquents.

It was noted that participation in acts of juvenile delinquency might not provide enough evidence to support the contention that delinquency participants harbor deviant value-belief preferences. Testing under controls imposed by the investigator did not show the institutionalized delinquent to be unique in value-beliefs when compared with adolescents in the general population. The evidence is more suggestive that the group selected might be considered an academic grouping rather than a deviant social entity in regard to values.

This suggestion is consistent with statements of other researchers. Gardner and Thompson[1] note that delinquency is a legal rather than a psychological concept. Similarly, Sol Rubin states:

> Juvenile delinquency is what the law says it is. It is a legal and sociological concept, not psychological. When psychologists and psychiatrists use the term, they use it in the legal sense, or more loosely as a sociological concept.[2]

Delinquent behavior in general, rather than a specific delinquent act, may not provide a distinct enough separation of delinquent from nondelinquent adolescents. Other research may provide results leading to a better understanding of the value-beliefs of institutionalized, EMR, delinquent adolescents when subjects are selected on the basis of specific delinquent acts or immoral behavior.

---

[1] Eric Gardner and Thompson, op. cit., chap. 16.

[2] Sol Rubin, "The Legal Character of Juvenile Delinquency," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLXI (January, 1949), 1-8.

It should be noted that the findings of this investigation are related to specific adolescents in two specific institutions. The investigator is hesitant to generalize to other EMR, delinquent, adolescent boys in other institutions for the mentally retarded. Future research will need to be undertaken to corroborate or refute these findings. Nonetheless, the investigator continues to feel that value-beliefs should not be overlooked in rehabilitation and education planning for the educable mentally retarded delinquent.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CHARACTERISTICS OF SUBJECTS

CHARACTERISTICS OF SUBJECTS

Code	AAA	AAT	TIR	IQ	Etiology	Race
Rome State School						
101	166	168	02	62	Familial	W
102	169	186	17	67	Undifferentiated	W
103	159	185	26	75	Familial	W
104	158	198	40	69	Familial	W
105	174	182	08	59	Familial	W
106	189	196	07	62	Familial	W
107	177	179	02	63	Familial	W
108	152	183	31	66	Undifferentiated	W
109	156	164	08	61	Familial	W
110	152	162	10	70	Undifferentiated	W
111	160	180	20	63	Undifferentiated	W
112	162	182	20	77	Undifferentiated	W
113	166	168	02	62	Familial	W
114	170	192	22	77	Familial	W
115	178	190	12	78	Familial	W
116	177	196	19	62	Familial	W
Syracuse State School						
217	131	177	46	58	Familial	W
218	146	149	03	66	Familial	W
219	141	185	44	64	Familial	W
220	160	197	37	50	Familial	W
221	139	187	48	73	Undifferentiated	W
222	149	191	42	70	Undifferentiated	W
223	149	190	41	68	Undifferentiated	W
224	161	171	10	68	Undifferentiated	W
225	135	145	10	63	Undifferentiated	W
226	113	173	60	67	Undifferentiated	W
227	161	165	04	65	Undifferentiated	W
228	147	187	40	65	Undifferentiated	W
229	159	188	29	68	Undifferentiated	W
230	112	167	55	67	Familial	W
231	127	174	47	67	Undifferentiated	W
232	159	165	06	55	Undifferentiated	W
233	165	175	10	60	Undifferentiated	W
234	165	177	12	71	Undifferentiated	W
235	110	148	38	69	Undifferentiated	W
236	128	176	48	62	Familial	W

Code	AAA	AAT	TIR	IQ	Etiology	Race
337	138	146	08	61	Undifferentiated	N
338	159	189	30	68	Undifferentiated	N
339	163	192	29	67	Undifferentiated	N
340	126	177	51	65	Familial	N
341	150	154	04	76	Familial	N
342	143	155	12	64	Undifferentiated	N
343	149	192	43	76	Undifferentiated	N
344	171	179	08	77	Undifferentiated	N
345	158	186	28	76	Undifferentiated	N
346	141	169	28	67	Undifferentiated	N
347	167	177	10	54	Undifferentiated	N
348	114	166	52	70	Undifferentiated	N
349	120	146	26	73	Undifferentiated	N
350	150	158	08	65	Undifferentiated	N
351	146	153	07	73	Undifferentiated	N
352	148	153	05	73	Undifferentiated	N
353	144	159	15	67	Undifferentiated	N
354	170	172	02	74	Undifferentiated	N
355	156	172	16	73	Undifferentiated	N
356	117	166	49	72	Undifferentiated	N
357	161	162	01	63	Undifferentiated	N
358	157	159	02	62	Undifferentiated	N

AAA = Age at admission
AAT = Age at testing
TIR = Time in residence
IQ = Intelligence quotient
W. = White
N = Negro

APPENDIX B

PERSONAL AND IMPERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENTS

M-Form

Name____________________________________Date______________

Grade___________School______________________________________

Almost everyone has a best friend to whom he can go for aid, advice and comfort when he is discouraged or in trouble of some kind. We would like you to think about all of the boys you know and select the one whom you consider to be your best friend. Write his name on the line below:

My best friend is____________________________________

If you would like, I will write his name for you.

In the remaining pages of this questionnaire we are going to present problem situations in which we want you to imagine that you are involved. You will be asked to decide in each problem situation how you think you ought to behave - what you believe you ought to say or do.

Now we are going to ask you to do one other thing. When we read a problem situation we may find a blank space after the words "best friend." Whenever we come across such a blank space, write the first name of your best friend in this blank space before deciding what you think you ought to do about the problem described.

Remember to write the first name of your best friend in the blank spaces.

Put an "X" on the short line to the left of the statement that best describes what you think you ought to do in each situation.

Turn the page to the first problem and we will begin.

1. Your best friend______________and you are at a school party with a group of your classmates. At eleven o'clock__________ says to you, "Let's go home. I promised my folks I would start home at eleven." You want to stay, and your parents have said that you could stay until the end of the party. Your other classmates encourage you to stay and let your friend go home by himself. One of them says, "Aw come on and stay! Everyone else is. We're just starting to have fun."

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Leave the party when your best friend does.

___ B. Do as the rest of your classmates want you to do and let your best friend go home alone.

2. You are just leaving the gym with Al, one of the members of the class baseball team. You just lost a game to a class team from a nearby school. The loss was largely due to some very poor fielding by Al. He is feeling very depressed and seeks reassurance and comfort from you by saying, "I guess we were off our game today. Everyone played sloppy ball."

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO SAY?

___ A. "All of us could have played better, I guess; but you were having a terrible time. What do you think was the trouble with your fielding?"

___ B. "We sure did! You certainly got some tough ones. I'm glad I didn't have to field some of those scorchers!"

3. One of your classmates has been ill in the hospital for a long time. Your class has voted to give him some candy, fruit, and books. You and your classmates have been asked to give as much as you wish to a gift fund. The contributions are to be placed in plain envelopes so no one will know how much money you contribute. You have been considering giving a dollar to the fund. Upon talking to your best friend _______________ and two other classmates you find that they are planning to give 50 cents. They suggest that you give the same amount.

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Give a dollar as you originally planned.

___ B. Give 50 cents like the rest of your friends.

4. You are with a group of your classmates when they start to talk about your best friend_______________. One of them says, "_______________thinks he is better than anyone else. He's getting to think he's so great that I can hardly stand him." The other join in by saying unkind things about your friend.

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Avoid trouble by saying nothing.

___ B. Say, "I think it's very unfair of you to say these things when he isn't here to defend himself. He's just as good as the rest of us."

5. You have been collecting donations from local business men to help pay for your Class Yearbook. You have collected $64 and several of the merchants have stated that they prefer that no one know how much they gave. You also happen to know that one of your classmates wants desperately to buy a book of tickets for the high school games, but cannot do so because his family is poor and need every penny they can get for necessities. The thought crosses your mind that you could buy him a book with $2 of the money you have collected and no one will ever know that you have used some of the money you have collected.

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Turn in all of the money that you have collected.

___ B. Buy a book of tickets for your classmate and give them to him because he couldn't go to the games otherwise.

6. You and your classmate played a trumpet duet for the school assembly. There was much applause. Feeling very good about his performance, your classmate says to a group of people you are standing with, "I guess I played it just about perfectly, didn't I?" You know that he slurred a number of high notes and that his timing was faulty in a number of instances.

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Be generous and say to the person next to you, "He certainly was terrific today."

___ B. Say, "It was a good performance but not perfect. You'd better do some practicing on those high notes."

7. Your best friend__________and some other classmates are planning to go to a football game to be held in a nearby community. You know that your parents would not approve of your going with them. Your friends urge you to come along.

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Go along and say nothing to your parents until you return.

___ B. Make some excuse for not going and leave the group.

8. Your best friend__________has been quarreling with a classmate over a long period of time. They have become bitter enemies. One day you and__________are leaving the school building just in time to see the disliked classmate slip on the steps. He gets up and says, "Would you fellows help me pick up my papers?" His papers are starting to blow all over the schoolyard. Your friend ignores him and starts walking away.

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Help him pick up his papers.

___ B. Ignore his request just as your best friend has done.

9. A classmate has played a practical joke on you by taking all the pencils, rulers, erasers, and pens from the teacher's desk and placing them in your desk. The teacher soon notices her loss, and says, "This isn't funny! Who took all the materials off my desk?" No one replies. At the end of the period everyone leaves the room to go to lunch. You brought your lunch that day so you settle back to eat it. As you open your desk you find to your great surprise that all the teacher's things are there.

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Say nothing and quickly remove the teacher's materials from your desk.

___ B. Give everything back to the teacher when she returns.

10. You notice that your best friend___________is frequently looking at the answers on your paper during an examination. The teacher also notices and accuses him of cheating. He refuses to say anything. The teacher turns to you and says, "He was copying from your paper, wasn't he?"

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO SAY?

____ A. "I'm sorry, but it did look like he was copying some of the answers from my paper."

____ B. "I think you must be mistaken. I'm sure he wouldn't cheat."

11. You are an onlooker while your best friend___________is having a hot argument with another classmate about the last school election. The classmate is losing the argument because he doesn't know the facts as well as your best friend. He is getting uneasy and turns to you with the question, "Which one of us do you think is right?"

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO SAY?

____ A. "I think you have some good points in your argument."

____ B. "I don't see any point in going on with the argument. Neither of you will probably ever convince the other.

12. Your mother has asked you to pick up some groceries for her. She gives you $10 and says, "This should be more than enough. Bring back the change." You go to the store, buy the groceries, and get back $2.58 in change. On your way home you see the display put on by UNICEF in their drive for funds for starving children. The picture of one of the children appeals to you especially. The thought crosses your mind of taking 25 cents of your mother's money and putting it in the donation box, even though you know your mother wants all the money.

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Go on home with the groceries and all of the money.

____ B. Take the quarter and put it in the box.

13. You, your best friend__________, and three other classmates have played a practical joke on your science teacher. You replaced the salt in one of his beakers with sugar so that his demonstration failed. He discovered what has happened and suspects that the five of you have played the trick. Angrily he asks if any of you had anything to do with it. All of the others deny it.

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Do as the others have done and deny that you know anything about it.

____ B. Confess that you were involved, but it was only meant as a harmless joke.

14. Your school basketball squad just played a game which, due to an unusually good job on your part, they won by a narrow margin. After the game, you, the members of the squad, and several other classmates are talking it over. Joe, one of your teammates, who is the weakest member of the team, looks anxious and seeks your reassurance about his part in the game. As he leaves the group he says, "We did all right tonight, didn't we!"

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Say, "Yes, we did, and I certainly think your playing helped swing it in our favor."

____ B. Wait until he has gone and say, "It was a terrific game. Joe did very well. If fact, all of you were real sharp tonight, or we couln't have won."

15. A classmate has saved his money to buy a new sport coat. He buys one that is loud in color and poorly cut. He is very proud of the new coat and says, "Isn't this something."

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO SAY?

____ A. "I don't like it very well, but I'm glad you do. Different people like different things."

____ B. "You certainly saved your money for a long time to buy that new coat, didn't you!"

16. You, your best friend__________, and a couple of your other friends have been buying school supplies in the local bookstore. You get your change from the clerk for a $5 bill and don't notice until all of you get outside the store that the clerk has made a mistake and given you an extra dollar in change. You call the error to the attention of your friends. Your best friend__________says, "You luckydog!" One of your other friends says, "Now you can treat us to an ice cream sundae!"

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Do what your friends suggest and buy them sundaes.
____ B. Take the extra money back to the clerk.

17. Your class is conducting a campaign to help some children in your town whose homes were wiped out in a flood. You tell your best friend________that you are planning to contribute the $5 you have been saving to go with him to hear a nationally known band and singer. He says, "Don't be foolish. No one will know whether you contribute or not and I have been planning on this for weeks. Please keep you money and go with me."

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Go ahead and put the $5 in the contribution box.
____ B. Keep the money and go to the performance with your best friend.

18. A classmate is obviously bothered because his steady girl friend went to the movies with another fellow the night before. You are present in a group of boys who are razzing the boy with remarks like, "You've lost her now for sure!" "Easy come, easy go!" "This is the end of the line for you, old pal!" The boy is getting very disturbed and says, "I can get her back if I want to!"

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO SAY?

____ A. "Sure you can. They're making a lot of fuss about nothing."
____ B. "Forget her! You can't win all the time! You've had it!"

19. The teacher has returned a set of examination papers to the class and is discussing the answers. She announces that after the discussion she is going to collect the papers and record the marks. You notice that two questions on your paper have been marked as correct when they are incorrect.

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Check the two incorrect answers and lower your score at the top of your paper.

____ B. Tell your teacher that some errors were made in correcting your paper.

20. You and your best friend________are discussing your history teacher. Your best friend doesn't like this teacher and says, "That guy is just plain ignorant. He doesn't know anything, not even history!"

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO SAY?

____ A. You shouldn't be so hard on him. He really tries hard!

____ B. Do you want to study with me for the test tomorrow?

21. You have just taken an important true-false examination in English. Your teacher has asked you to exchange papers so that you can grade each other's papers as she reads the answers aloud. You exchange papers with your best friend ________who is seated near you. He slips a note which reads, "Please change a few of my answers when they are incorrect. I have to get a passing mark on this test."

WHAT DO YOU THINK YOU OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Help your friend so that he will get a passing mark on the test.

____ B. Mark his paper in the same way you would grade the paper of any other classmate.

Personal VEMS

	A	B
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		

L	H	T	K	G	C	I

Key

Personal VEMS

	A	B
1	L*	C
2	T	K
3	G	C
4	I	L*
5	H	K
6	G	T
7	C	I
8	K	L*
9	I	H
10	T	L*
11	K	I
12	H	G
13	C	T
14	K	G
15	T	I
16	C	H
17	G	L*
18	K	C
19	H	T
20	G	I
21	L*	H

Legend

L = Loyalty
H = Honesty
T = Truthfulness
K = Kindness
G = Generosity
C = Conformity
I = Impunitiveness

[*] Keyed for Loyalty

VEMS (Impersonal)

M-Form

Name________________________________Date____________________

Grade______________School____

In this booklet we are going to present problem situations in which different groups of teenagers are involved. In each case we are interested in what one of these people will do or say. To make it easier for you to be certain which person is meant, we will use the name Bob each time, even though Bob may represent several different people. You will be asked to decide in each situation how you think Bob ought to behave--what you believe he ought to say or do.

SCHOOL

1. Bob and his best friend, Sam, were talking about their plans for serving as junior counselors at summer camp together when Sam said, "Maybe I won't be able to go. I'm so terrible in Social Studies that I may have to go to summer school instead. My only chance is to get a real high grade on my outside project which is due tomorrow. You're a brain in Social Studies. I sure wish you could help me."

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Refuse to help him on the grounds that it wouldn't be right.

___ B. Say, "Since you are my best friend, you can copy my paper. You have a different teacher so it won't matter."

2. It was lunch period and Bill, one of Bob's classmates said, "We sure are giving this substitute teacher the works, aren't we!" Bob said, "He doesn't seem like such a bad guy. He hasn't got a chance. Let's give him a break." Bill replied, "Who cares about him. We're having fun. Bob, are you with us or not?"

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO SAY?

___ A. "Sure I am. I was only kidding."

___ B. "I think we ought to give him a break."

3. Bob and Paul, whom Bob didn't know very well, were leaving an English class where Paul had just given an oral report. Paul had stuttered, forgotten what he was going to say, and in general had done a terrible job. Looking for reassurance he turned to Bob and said, "How did it go?"

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO SAY?

___ A. "You sure made a mess of that! What happened?"

___ B. "You didn't do badly. I think the teacher liked it."

4. Sam, Bob's best friend, was arguing with Joe about the answer to a question on the Science final examination. Sam, obviously knowing less about the question than Joe, turned to Bob and asked, "Which one of us do you think is right?"

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. "You are right, pal. I'm with you."

___ B. Avoid taking sides and say, "You both have some good points. I don't know who is right."

5. Bob and his best friend, Sam, were discussing a new student. Bob said, "He sure looks lonesome. Let's go talk to him." Sam said, "He doesn't look like much to me. Why bother! If you want to waste your time that way I'm going over to see Joe."

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Leave his friend and go over to the new boy.

___ B. Stay with his friend and forget the new boy.

6. Don, a new boy in Bob's class, had been called upon to translate a French passage which had been the previous night's assignment. He hadn't done his homework so he stumbled rather badly through the passage. On their way to the next class Don said to Bob, "I'm way down in French. You don't think I messed that up too much do you?"

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Change the subject by saying, "Do you suppose we will have a test tomorrow?"

___ B. Say in a kindly way, "No! You did O.K."

7. During the final examination in Science the teacher stepped out of the room. All the pupils, with the exception of Bob, started to check their answers with their neighbors. Wally turned to Bob and asked what he had for the third question.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Say, "If everyone is comparing papers I might as well too, so here it is."

___ B. Shake his head and refuse to answer him.

8. Bob's class had finished an objective test and the teacher had asked the students to exchange papers and mark them as he read off the answers. When Bob received his own paper back he noticed that five items were marked correct that were actually wrong.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Check the incorrect answers and lower his score.

___ B. Tell the teacher that some errors had been made in correcting his paper.

9. Bob was marking Jane's paper while the teacher read the answers. Jane was a poor student although she tried hard. When the teacher had gone about halfway through the items Jane leaned over and whispered to Bob, "I've just got to pass this test. Please change a few of my wrong answers so they will be right."

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Help Jane so that she would have a high enough score to pass.

___ B. Shake his head and refuse on grounds that it wouldn't be right to change her answers.

10. Bob and his best friend, Sam, had been working alone in the chemistry lab. Bob thought he saw Sam doing something at Joe's table. A few minutes later as the teacher entered the lab there was a small explosion at Joe's table. The teacher, knowing that Bob and Sam had been alone in the lab, asked Bob whether Sam had been responsible for the explosion.

WHAT DO THINK BOB OUGHT TO SAY?

____ A. "I'm sure Sam wouldn't do a thing like that."

____ B. "I don't know. I thought I saw Sam doing something at Joe's table."

11. Bob accidentally found out that several of his classmates had obtained copies of the math exam to be given on Friday. They offered him a copy and asked him not to tell anyone, since anything he might do or say would only cause trouble.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Be honest and take a copy of the examination to the teacher.

____ B. Avoid becoming involved by refusing to accept a copy of the exam and forgetting the entire incident.

12. Bob was with a group of classmates when they started to talk about John, who was not present. No one had a good word to say about John, although Bob thought he seemed nice enough. Finally, one of the group said, "He acts as if he knows everything. What do you think Bob?"

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Say, "I guess you're right. He isn't much."

____ B. Avoid trouble by saying nothing.

13. Bob and some classmates had been working late the previous afternoon in the woodworking shop along with several other groups. The next morning the instructor accused Bob's group of not cleaning up the part of the shop where they had been working. In spite of the fact that they had been in a hurry the day before and had left everything in a mess, each one denied the accusation strongly. The instructor turned to Bob and asked, "Did you stay and clean up your part of the mess?"

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Agree with the others and say, "Yes, we didn't leave until things were in good shape."

____ B. "No, I was in a hurry and didn't do any cleaning up."

14. As Bob walked up the school corridor he overheard a group of boys talking in angry tones to his best friend, Sam. Sam had played a joke on the teacher who kept the whole class after school since Sam refused to admit his guilt.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Defend Sam and tell the group they are being poor sports.

____ B. Side with the group.

15. The teacher had just finished doing a hard algebra problem on the board at the request of the class. He stepped back and said, "See, that wasn't very difficult." Bob noticed an error in his work.

WHAT DO THINK BOB OUGHT TO SAY?

____ A. Say, "I don't believe that is the right answer."

____ B. Say nothing.

HOME

1. Bob's best friend, Sam, was spending the week-end at Bob's house. Sam had recently been in some serious trouble with the police and was telling Bob all about it. He had hardly finished, when Bob's mother appeared and asked Bob to come downstairs and see her for a moment. When they arrived in the kitchen she said that she had heard some rumors about Sam and wanted Bob to tell her everything he might know about them.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Tell his mother all that Sam had told him about the trouble.

___ B. Protect his friend by telling his mother that Sam was a nice fellow and that he didn't even want to discuss anything uncomplimentary about him.

2. New neighbors had just moved next door to Bob, and Bob's family were talking about them at the evening meal. Bob's mother and father complained about the mess they had left in the yard, and his brother and sister laughed about the neighbor's children's strange clothes. Bob had spoken with the newcomers the day before and they had seemed friendly and pleasant.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Agree with the rest of the family that the people next door were not likely to be good neighbors.

___ B. Say that the newcomers would probably be good neighbors after they had a chance to get settled.

3. Bob's younger brother, Tim, had brought home a painting which he had done at school and of which he was very proud. As Bob looked at it he thought, "Isn't that awful." Time said to Bob, "Don't you think my picture is really good?"

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO SAY?

___ A. "Yes, that is a very nice picture."

___ B. "It probably isn't bad for a boy your age, but it really isn't very good."

4. The evening newspaper had been late for about a week and Bob's mother asked him to speak to the newsboy, who was his best friend, Sam.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Defend Sam and tell his mother that he is a good newsboy and doing the best he can.

___ B. Avoid the situation by saying nothing to either Sam or his mother.

5. Bob's younger brother, Paul, was playing in the yard with one of the neighborhood children. For a while they played peacefully, but finally Paul started to hit his playmate and say all kinds of nasty things about him. His companion called to Bob and asked him to stop Paul.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Tell the neighbor child that he was sorry and tell Paul that he was being unkind and to play peacefully and pleasantly.

___ B. Defend his brother and say, "Paul wouldn't have hit you without a good reason."

6. Bob's younger brother, Paul, who had been punished by his mother for something he didn't do, was very unhappy and came up to Bob and his girl friend for a sympathetic hearing.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Listen sympathetically and comfort his brother.

___ B. Avoid being involved by saying, "These things happen to everyone."

7. The members of Bob's family were talking about income tax at dinner one night. The father said that most people listed expenses they didn't have, if they thought that they could get away with it. He said, "Since everyone does this we have to also make things fair." The rest of the family agreed.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Agree with the rest.

___ B. Disagree with his father and insist that his father not list expenses that he doesn't have.

8. Bob asked his father for some money to go to the ball game. His father said, "I have only five dollars left but since tomorrow is payday you may take the five dollar bill that is in my wallet. Jane, go up to the bedroom and get it for your brother." Jane came back and handed Bob the bill. While putting it in his billfold, as he went out the door, he noticed that he had two five dollar bills which had been stuck together.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Take one five dollar bill and put it back in his father's wallet.

___ B. Go back and tell his father that there were two five dollar bills instead of one.

9. Bob's father had heard from a friend that Bob had been very unselfish and had done a fine deed for an elderly lady. He called Bob into his study and told him how proud he was to have a son like Bob. Bob knew that the good deed had been done by another boy rather than himself.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Tell his father that he hadn't been the one who did it.

___ B. Just listen and not say anything.

10. Bob was cleaning the cellar one Saturday when he found some tools belonging to his father pushed back into a far corner of the cellar. Bob noticed that one of the tools was broken, and he remembered that his brother had borrowed the tools a few weeks before. He didn't know whether his brother had broken the tool or not.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Put the broken tool back into the corner and the others on his father's workbench in order to avoid any problems with his brother.

____ B. Show the broken tool to his father.

11. Bob and his friends while running across the yard, stepped on a soft concrete walk Bob's father had laid. Jim said, "Keep going fast and no one will ever know we did it." All the group followed.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Continue running with the group.

____ B. Go back and tell his father exactly what happened.

12. Bob was having a group of boys and girls at his house for the evening. His mother had told him that if they wanted to dance, they could do so in the recreation room but asked him to please not dance in the living room. As the evening wore on a number of couples started to dance in the living room.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Dance in the living room with the others?

____ B. Go down with some of his friends to the recreation room, hoping that the others would follow.

13. One hot day Bob's younger brother, Dan, came to him and asked Bob to give him some money so he could go with his friends to get something cool to eat or drink. Bob said that he would like to give Dan the money but that he didn't have any. Dan said that often when his father didn't have any money he would just write a note to the grocer and sign it. He asked, "Please, Bob, won't you write a note to the grocer and sign Dad's name?"

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Be kind to his brother and write the note.

____ B. Refuse to write the note since it wouldn't be right to sign his father's name.

14. Bob and his family were eating their evening meal when the conversation turned to Bob's best friend, Sam. Bob's sister commented that he was a very sloppy dresser. His mother said that she had noticed this too. Before they had finished each member of the family had made some criticism of Sam. Bob sat in uncomfortable silence.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Say that Sam was a great guy and that he didn't dress much differently from the rest of the gang.

____ B. Join in the criticism of Sam.

15. Bob and his best friend, Sam, who was planning to visit Bob over the weekend, had just arrived from school with their report cards. Sam said to Bob that his card was so terrible he didn't dare take it home. He went on, "If you are a true friend you will copy my Dad's signature on my card."

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Say, "I don't like to do this but I will since you are my best friend."

____ B. Fail to sign the card even though he'd like to since it wouldn't be right.

OUTSIDE HOME AND SCHOOL

1. Bob, as president, was chairing a meeting of a community debating club at the time they were electing next year's president. As a result of the voting there was a tie between Sam, Bob's best friend and Joe, the most efficient club member and best debater in the group. Bob, who had to cast the deciding note, was torn between voting for friendship or for the very best person.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Vote for his friend, Sam.

___ B. Vote for the most competent person, Joe.

2. Bob, and the members of the baseball team were in the locker room after they had lost to their bitterest rivals by a score of 3 - 2. All the boys were talking about the defeat being due to Pete's dropping of an easy fly. Many were blaming him directly.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Join in with the others in blaming Pete.

___ B. Point out that Pete was a good ball player and that it was just his misfortune that his error occurred when it did.

3. Bob had just arrived at the meeting room of his club, which had been decorated for a dance. As he looked around, he could hardly hold back an exclamation of disappointment. Just then the chairman of the decorating committee came up and in an anxious voice said, "Didn't we do a good job with the little money we had?"

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO SAY?

___ A. Say, "Yes, you did a good job. It looks very nice."

___ B. Say, "I'm sure you worked hard but it certainly isn't as nice as I had expected."

4. A group of Bob's friends were discussing his best friend, Sam, when they were together at the drug store. Most of them were saying uncomplimentary things. Bob, after listening for awhile, became very uncomfortable.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Excuse himself and leave the group.

___ B. Defend Sam and tell the group they didn't know what they were talking about to say such things about Sam.

5. Bob and his best friend, Sam, were looking at an exhibition of the work of members of the photography club. As they came to Ernie's exhibit, Sam, who claimed to be quite an expert on photography, said, "I don't see why that was ever included!" Bob looked over his shoulder and saw Ernie looking very uncomfortable and unhappy.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Forget about Ernie and agree with his friend that he didn't think much of the picture either.

___ B. Say that Ernie had worked hard in photography and that it seemed like an interesting shot to him.

6. Bob was at a party where the boys and girls were gathered in small groups talking and eating refreshments. The group he was with began talking about what a horrible person their math teacher was. Each one apparently tried to outdo the other.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Befriend the teacher and take exception to the bad things that were being said about him.

___ B. Walk away and join another group.

7. Bob and a number of his friends had paper routes. The group obtained their papers from a truck where each boy counted out the number he was supposed to deliver. For some time the boys, with the exception of Bob, had each been taking ten papers more than they should. Finally, Joe told Bob he ought to do the same as the rest.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Do the same as the others and take ten extra papers also.

___ B. Refuse to take any more papers than he was charged for.

8. Bob, who was treasurer of his club, received a statement from the bank stating that his accounts were two dollars short. After thinking a bit he recalled that he had given two members credit for dues which they hadn't paid as yet. He was to meet with the club adviser that day to go over his accounts.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. Tell the club adviser that his accounts were short because he had marked two people paid who had not paid as yet.

___ B. Pay the two dollars himself since he was responsible for the money.

9. Bob and his best friend, Sam, had borrowed Sam's father's car without his knowing it. While they were out they bumped a front fender making a small dent in it. They returned the car to the exact spot, where it had been previously parked, without anyone knowing it had been moved. Later Sam's father noticed the dent and asked the boys if they knew anything about it. Sam said, "no."

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

___ A. He should support his friend.

___ B. He should say that they had taken the car and had been responsible for the dent.

10. Bob had been collecting money for the Red Cross and had about $60 on hand. As he was walking home he met an old man, Mr. Jones, who he knew was needy and so poor that he often didn't have enough food to eat. When Bob asked Mr. Jones how he was, he said that he hadn't been doing very well--that he owed $15 on his rent and was being threatened by his landlord.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Give the old man $15 out of the money he had collected.

____ B. Return the $60 to the Red Cross headquarters.

11. Bob was with a few of his friends at a drugstore when they sneaked the milkshake mixer from the back of the counter and hid it under a booth. Just as they were leaving, a customer ordered a milkshake, and the owner looked for the mixer. When he couldn't find it, he called to the boys and asked if they knew where the mixer was.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Show the owner where the mixer was.

____ B. Avoid any problems with his friends or the owner by saying nothing.

12. Bob was attending a citizenship club meeting where a very hot political discussion between Jim (Bob and Jim were the only Republican sympathizers in the group) and the remainder of the group.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Side with the group against Jim even though he argues with Jim's position.

____ B. Say nothing so people will not know which side he is on.

13. Bob and some of his friends were playing ball in the park. One of the boys hit the ball so hard that it broke the windshield of a police car. All the boys started to run.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Keep running with the rest of the boys.

____ B. Go back and tell the policeman that the window had been broken by accident.

14. Sam, Bob's best friend, had been accused of stealing an automobile. All of Bob's friends were talking about it and all were assuming Sam was guilty, although no one had any first hand information. As time passed the things that the other boys said about Sam became more and more nasty.

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Defend his friend vigorously.

____ B. Go along with the opinion of the group and agree that with all this talk there must be some truth in the accusation even though he thought that Sam had been a nice guy.

15. While Bob was attending a dance, he noticed that Joe, one of the boys he knew, was wearing a new, but loud and garish suit. As they met Joe said proudly, "How do you like my new suit? Isn't it a dandy?"

WHAT DO YOU THINK BOB OUGHT TO DO?

____ A. Say that he was sorry, but that the suit was not one he would care for.

____ B. Say, "Everyone sure is dressed up tonight aren't they?"

Impersonal VERBS

	A	B	
1			School
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
xxxxx	xxxxx	xxxxx	
1			Home
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
xxxxx	xxxxx	xxxxx	
1			Outside
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			

	L	H	T	K	C	I
School						
Home						
Outside						
Total						

Impersonal VEMS

Key to Values for Each Choice

	A	B	
1	H	L*	School
2	C	KG	
3	T	KG	
4	L*	I	
5	KG	L*	
6	I	KG	
7	C	H	
8	H	T	
9	KG	H	
10	L*	T	
11	H	I	
12	C	I	
13	C	T	
14	L*	C	
15	T	I	
xxxxx	xxxxx	xxxxx	
1	T	L*	Home
2	C	KG	
3	KG	T	
4	L*	I	
5	KG	L*	
6	KG	I	
7	C	H	
8	H	T	
9	T	I	
10	I	H	
11	C	T	
12	C	I	
13	KG	H	
14	L*	C	
15	L*	H	
xxxxx	xxxxx	xxxxx	
1	L*	H	Outside
2	C	KG	
3	KG	T	
4	I	L*	
5	L*	KG	
6	KG	I	
7	C	H	
8	T	H	
9	L*	T	
10	KG	H	
11	H	I	
12	C	I	
13	C	T	
14	L*	C	
15	T	I	

Legend

L = Loyalty

H = Honesty

T = Truthfulness

KG = Kindness-Generosity

C = Conformity

I = Impunitiveness

*Keyed for Loyalty

APPENDIX C

SCORES OBTAINED ON THE *PERSONAL* AND *IMPERSONAL VEMS* INSTRUMENTS

SCORES OBTAINED ON THE PERSONAL AND IMPERSONAL VEMS INSTRUMENTS

Code	Personal VEMS							Impersonal VEMS					
	L	H	T	K	G	C	I	L	H	T	KG	C	I
101	2	6	4	1	2	3	3	05	13	07	08	03	09
102	2	4	4	4	2	1	4	07	06	08	10	05	09
103	1	5	5	4	2	0	4	04	12	13	08	02	06
104	2	4	4	2	6	0	3	03	11	10	13	02	06
105	4	2	4	3	4	1	3	05	09	09	10	05	07
106	6	4	2	3	3	0	3	07	10	09	10	04	05
107	2	5	3	2	3	1	5	06	11	08	09	01	11
108	4	3	3	2	3	1	5	03	10	07	10	07	08
109	4	2	2	5	3	2	3	12	06	06	10	07	04
110	4	5	3	2	4	0	3	05	12	09	10	01	08
111	4	3	5	3	2	2	2	06	08	09	13	04	05
112	4	2	3	4	5	0	3	06	10	10	07	06	06
113	1	3	4	2	5	2	4	06	07	06	12	07	07
114	4	4	4	0	3	2	4	01	10	13	07	02	12
115	2	5	5	1	4	1	3	04	11	11	09	02	08
116	2	4	4	4	4	0	3	04	09	10	11	03	08
217	1	4	3	4	2	3	4	04	07	13	10	06	05
218	4	2	3	3	2	3	4	11	07	06	10	04	07
219	3	3	5	3	2	1	4	07	13	09	05	02	09
220	4	3	6	4	2	0	2	06	07	09	07	05	11
221	2	5	4	4	1	1	4	04	13	10	09	00	09
222	2	5	3	4	4	2	1	05	10	09	08	06	07
223	2	5	6	2	4	1	1	04	12	11	08	03	07
224	2	4	3	2	4	2	4	06	12	09	09	01	08
225	2	4	3	1	5	3	3	05	10	08	09	05	08
226	3	4	3	2	4	3	2	03	14	08	09	01	10
227	6	2	3	2	2	3	3	06	06	10	11	03	09
228	2	4	4	4	5	0	2	03	07	09	10	04	12
229	1	4	4	3	4	2	3	06	10	10	06	01	12
230	3	6	2	4	2	1	3	07	12	06	10	03	07
231	2	4	3	4	1	3	4	07	08	09	09	05	07
232	3	4	2	3	4	1	4	08	07	09	11	03	07
233	2	5	5	2	2	2	3	08	07	06	08	05	11
234	4	3	4	5	2	0	3	04	09	10	10	04	08
235	2	5	5	2	2	1	4	09	06	09	12	05	04
236	3	6	2	4	3	1	2	07	10	08	09	05	06

Code	Personal VEMS							Impersonal VEMS					
	L	H	T	K	G	C	I	L	H	T	KG	C	I
337	3	2	4	5	5	1	1	08	09	03	13	07	05
338	2	3	4	3	4	0	4	06	10	11	08	01	05
339	2	3	5	4	2	0	5	05	10	11	08	04	07
340	2	5	4	2	4	1	3	05	13	10	11	00	06
341	3	4	4	3	1	2	4	04	12	13	07	02	07
342	0	6	4	3	2	1	5	07	12	07	11	01	07
343	2	5	6	1	3	1	3	04	11	11	08	00	11
344	2	5	3	4	4	0	3	04	11	11	11	01	07
345	3	3	6	3	3	2	1	02	11	14	08	02	08
346	2	4	4	3	2	4	2	06	07	08	12	09	03
347	2	5	2	3	3	1	5	05	08	09	11	08	04
348	2	3	5	3	5	0	3	06	11	11	10	01	06
349	3	4	3	4	2	3	2	07	05	09	11	09	04
350	3	3	2	5	4	0	4	07	12	06	09	05	06
351	3	5	4	3	2	1	3	05	10	09	09	03	09
352	1	6	4	2	4	2	2	03	11	10	07	05	09
353	2	5	3	2	4	2	3	04	10	08	10	04	09
354	3	5	5	1	3	1	3	04	11	12	08	01	09
355	1	4	5	2	4	4	1	06	11	10	12	02	04
356	2	5	5	2	4	0	3	07	08	10	12	03	05
357	2	4	3	5	4	0	3	05	10	10	11	00	09
358	3	4	4	2	3	1	4	05	06	11	10	05	08

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abel, Theordora M. "Moral Judgments Among Subnormals," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XXXVI (1941), 378-92.

Abel, Theordora M. "Moral Judgments of Subnormal Adolescent Girls," *Psychological Bulletin*, XXXVII (1940), 506. [Non-existent.]

Abrahamsen, David. *Who Are the Guilty*. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1952.

Adams, Arthur S. "Foreword," *The College Influence on Student Character*. Edited by Edward D. Eddy, Jr., Mary L. Parkhurst, and James S. Yakovakis. Washington: American Council on Education, 1959, p. v.

Ambrose, Edna and Miel, Alice. *Children's Social Learning*. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1958.

American Association on Mental Deficiency, *Listings of State and Private Training Schools and Homes for the Retarded*, Directory of the American Association on Mental Deficiency, Appendix A. Willimantic, Conn.: The Association, 1960.

Axelrad, S. "Negro and White Male Institutionalized Delinquents," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVII (1952), 569-74.

Barnes, Harry Elmer and Tetters, Negley K. *New Horizons in Criminology*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1943.

Beattie, Ronald H. "Problems of Criminal Statistics in the United States," *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, XLVI (July-August, 1955), 178-86.

Bell, Daniel. "Crime as an American Way of Life," The Antioch Review, XIII (June, 1953), 131-54.

Benjamin, Harold. "The Problems of Education," An Outline of Man's Knowledge of the Modern World. Edited by Lyman Bryson. Garden City: Nelson Doubleday, Inc., 1960, pp. 373-88.

Bennett, Ivy. Delinquent and Neurotic Children. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.

Birnbaum, Karl. "A Court Psychiatrist's View of Juvenile Delinquents," Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLXI (January, 1949), 55-63.

Bisio, B. "Oligophrenic Deficiency and Social Sensitivity. The Problem of Moral Judgment in Mental Defectives Based on the Combined Results of the Alexander, Rorschach and De Sanctis Tests," Revista Sperimentale Di Freniatria e Medicina Legale Delle Alienazioni Mentali (Reggio-Emilia), LXXXIV (1960), 204-47.

Bolduc, Thomas E. "Social Value-need Patterns in Mental Retardates," Dissertation Abstracts, XX (October-December, 1959), 1857-1858.

________. "Social Value-need Patterns in Mental Retardates," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXIV (1960), 472-79.

Borrowman, Merle L. "Traditional Values and the Shaping of American Education," Social Forces Influencing American Education, Sixtieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961, pp. 144-70.

Butts, R. Freeman. A Cultural History of Western Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955.

California, State of. Welfare and Institutions Code. Sacramento, State of California, 1943.

Cammack, James S. Morality Problem with Feeblemindedness. Stockholm: Natur Och Kultur, 1947.

Cammade, James S. Moral Problems of Mental Defect. London: Burns, Oates, 1954.

Carr, Lowell. Delinquency Control. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Chandler, Charles, Shafter, Albert, and Coe, Rodney. "Arraignment, Examination, and Confinement of the Mentally Defective Delinquent," American Journal of Mental Deficiency. LXIII (January, 1959), 723-29.

Charles, Don C. "Ability and Accomplishment of Persons Earlier Judged Mentally Deficient," Genetic Psychology Monographs, XLVII (1953), 3-71.

Clinard, Marshall B. Sociology of Deviant Behavior. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1957.

Cloward, Richard A. and Ohlin, Lloyd E. "Illegitimate Means and Delinquent Subcultures," Delinquency and Opportunity. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961, pp. 145-52.

Cohen, Albert K. Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955.

Cohen, Albert K. and Short, James F., Jr. "Research in Delinquent Subculture," Journal of Social Issues, XIV (1958).

Cohen, Julius S. "Employer Attitudes Toward Hiring Mentally Retarded Individuals," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXVII, No. 5 (March, 1963), 705-13.

Cole, Luella. *Psychology of Adolescence*. 3d ed.; New York: Rinehart and Co., 1948.

Committee on Statistics: American Association on Mental Deficiency. *Statistical Manual for the Use of Institutions for Mental Defectives*. Utica, N.Y.: State Hospital Press, 1941.

Criuckshank, William M. "Current Educational Practice with Exceptional Children," *Education of Exceptional Children and Youth*. Edited by William M. Cruickshank and G. Orville Johnson. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958, pp. 43-93.

________. "Planning for the Severely Retarded Child," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXI (July, 1956), 3-9.

Davies, Stanley P. with Ecob, Katherine G. *The Mentally Retarded in Society*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Durea, Mervin A. and Taylor, G. J. "The Mentality of Delinquent Boys Appraised by the Wechsler-Bellevue Intelligence Tests," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LII (April, 1948), 342-44.

Edgerton, Robert B. "A Patient Elite: Ethnography in a Hospital for the Mentally Retarded," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXVIII, No. 3 (November, 1963), 372-85.

Educational Policies Commission. *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools*. Washington: Educational Policies Commission, 1951.

Ellingston, John R. *Protecting Our Children from Criminal Careers*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1948.

Farrell, Malcolm J. and Ogonik, John. "The Present Status of Defective Delinquency in Massachusetts," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, XLIX, No. 3 (January, 1955), 439-44.

Farrell, Malcolm J., Ogonik, John, and Pichey, J. Raymond. "A Preliminary Study of Behavior Problems in a State School and Therapeutic Plans for Prevention and Rehabilitation," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXII, No. 1 (1957), 26-31.

Feder, D. D. and Miller, L. W. "An Evaluation of Certain Aspects of a Program of Character Education," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXIV (1933), 385-91.

Ferentz, Edward J. "Mental Deficiency Related to Crime," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XLV, No. 3 (September-October, 1954), 299-307.

Foale, Martha. "An Approach to Stabilization of Male Juvenile Mental Defective Delinquents," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LVII (July, 1952), 116-22.

Gardner, Eric F. and Thompson, George G. "Investigation and Measurement of the Social Values Governing Interpersonal Relations Among Adolescent Youth and Their Teachers," Cooperative Research Project No. 259A (8418) SU and 259B (8418) OSU, Syracuse University and Ohio State University, 1963. (Mimeographed.)

Gardner, William I. and Nisonger, Herschel W. "A Manual on Program Development in Mental Retardation," Monograph Supplement, American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXVI, No. 4 (January, 1962), 90-92.

Garfield, Sol L. "Abnormal Behavior and Mental Deficiency," Handbook of Mental Deficiency. Edited by Norman R. Ellis. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963, pp. 574-601.

Goddard, Henry H. The Criminal Imbecile. New York: Macmillan Co., 1915.

Goldstein, Herbert. "Population Trends in U. S. Public Institutions for the Mentally Deficient," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXIII, No. 4 (January, 1959), 599-604.

________. "Social and Occupational Adjustment," Mental Retardation: A Review of Research. Edited by Harvey A. Stevens and Rick Heber. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp. 214-58.

Goldstein, Herbert and Seigle, Dorothy M. "Characteristics of Educable Mentally Handicapped Children," Mental Retardation. Edited by Jerome H. Rothstein. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962, pp. 204-30.

Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1942, pp. 198-219, Table D, Appendix.

Guthrie, George M., Butler, Alfred, and Gorlow, Leon. "Personality Differences between Institutionalized and Non-Institutionalized Retardates," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXVII, No. 4 (January, 1963), 543-48.

Hartshorne, Hugh and May, Mark A. Studies in the Nature of Character: I, Studies in Deceit. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1928.

Havighurst, Robert J. and Taba, Hilda. Adolescent Character and Personality. New York: John Wiley and Son, 1949.

Heber, Rick. "A Manual on Terminology and Classification in Mental Retardation," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXIV, No. 2 (September, 1959), Monograph Supplement.

Hobbs, Mary T. "A Comparison of Institutionalized and Non-Institutionalized Mentally Retarded," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, XLIX, No. 2 (September, 1964), 206-10.

Hurlock, Elizabeth. *Adolescent Development*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955.

Ingram, Christine P. *Education of the Slow-Learning Child*. 2d ed. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1953.

Johnson, G. Orville. "Comparative Studies of Some Learning Characteristics in Mentally Retarded and Normal Children of the Same Mental Age," Syracuse University Research Institute, 1958.

________. *Education for the Slow Learners*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

________. "The Education of Mentally Handicapped Children," *Education of Exceptional Children and Youth*. Edited by William M. Cruickshank and G. Orville Johnson. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958, pp. 189-226.

________. "Special Education for the Mentally Handicapped--A Paradox," *Exceptional Children*, XXIX, No. 2 (October, 1962), 62-69.

Jones, Vernon. *Character and Citizenship Training in the Public School*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936.

Kalhorn, J. "Studies in Topological and Vector Psychology: III, Values and Sources of Authority among Rural Children," *University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare*, XX, 1945.

Kennedy, Ruby Jo. *The Social Adjustment of Morons in a Connecticut City*. Hartford, Conn.: Mansfield-Southbury Training Schools, Social Service Department, 1948.

Kephart, William M. "The Negro Offender: An Urban Research Project," *American Journal of Sociology*, LX, No. 1 (July, 1954), 46-50.

Kirk, Samuel and Johnson, G. Orville. *Educating the Retarded Child*. Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951.

Kluckhohn, Clyde. "Education, Values, and Anthropological Relativity," *Culture and Behavior*. Edited by Richard Kluckhohn. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962, pp. 286-300.

Kobrin, Solomon. "The Conflict of Values in Delinquency," *American Sociological Review*, XVI (October, 1951), 653-61.

Kowrach, Edward J. "Moral and Religious Aspects of the Problems of Retarded Children," *Education*, LXXVI, No. 2 (October, 1955), 102-106.

Kuhlen, Raymond. *The Psychology of Adolescent Development*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

Kvaraceus, William C. *Juvenile Delinquency and the School*. Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Co., 1945.

Sister Mary Laurine. "How to Present Religious and Moral Truths to Mentally Handicapped Children," *National Catholic Education Association Bulletin*, LVIII (August, 1961), 417-18.

Maennel, B. The Auxiliary Schools of Germany. Translated by Fletcher B. Dresslar. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1907.

Martens, Elise H. Curriculum Adjustments for the Mentally Retarded, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Bulletin 1954, No. 2. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1957.

McKinney's Consolidated Laws of New York (Annotated), Book 52-A, Social Welfare Law. Brooklyn: Edward Thompson Co., 1941.

Merrill, Maud Amanda. Problems of Child Delinquency. Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947.

Metfessel, Milton and Lovell, Constance, "Recent Literature on Individual Correlates of Crime." Psychological Bulletin, XXXIX (1942), 133-64.

Morris, J. V. "A Special Unit for Delinquent Defectives," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXII (1957), 432-35.

Morris, Van Cleve. Philosophy and the American School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.

Murphy, Fred J., Shirley, Mary M., and Witmer, Helen L. "The Incidence of Hidden Delinquency," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry (October, 1946), pp. 686-96.

New York State Commission of Correction. Thirty-Fourth Annual Report. Albany: State Commission of Correction, 1961.

New York, State of. One Hundredth Annual Report of Syracuse State School to the Department of Mental Hygiene. Utica, N. Y.: State Hospitals Press, March, 1950.

Nye, F. Ivan, Short, James F., Jr., and Olson, Virgil J. "Socio-Economic Status and Delinquent Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, LXIII (January, 1958), 381-89.

Olson, Willard. "Character Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by Walter S. Monroe. Rev. ed.: New York: The Macmillan Co., 1952, pp. 126-33.

Overstreet, Ben, Jr. "A Study of the Youthful Offender," Proceedings: American Correctional Association, 1963. Washington: The Association, 1963, pp. 245-53.

Pense, Arthur W. "The Problem of the Male Defective Delinquent in the State School," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, XLVII, No. 4 (April, 1943), 467-72.

Pense, Arthur W., Patton, Robert, and Hills, Granville. "The Use of Sampling Techniques to Determine the Extent of Patients' Physical Care Needs in Several Institutions," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXVII, No. 2 (September, 1962), 211-17.

Peters, Roswell B. "The Education Program in the Rome State School," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LI (1946), 280-85.

________. "The Role of the Institution Academic School in the Rehabilitation of the Mentally Retarded," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXIII, No. 3 (November, 1958), 506-10.

Porterfield, Austin L. Youth in Trouble. Fort Worth: Leo Potishman Foundation, 1946.

The President's Panel on Mental Retardation. Bibliography of World Literature on Mental Retardation: January 1940-March 1963. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

________. A Proposed Program for National Action to Combat Mental Retardation. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

Pressey, Sidney L. and Kuhlen, Raymond G. Psychological Development Through the Life Span. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Quay, Herbert C. "The Delinquent," Behavioral Research on Exceptional Children. Edited by Samuel A. Kirk and Bluma B. Weiner. Washington: Council for Exceptional Children, N.E.A., 1963, pp. 318-56.

Rafferty, Max. "The Cult of the Slob," Phi Delta Kappan, XL, No. 2 (November, 1958).

Redl, Fritz and Wineman, David. The Agressive Child. Glencoe: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1957.

Remmers, H. H. and Shimberg, B. Purdue Opinion Poll for Young People. Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 1949.

Report to the Congress on Juvenile Delinquency. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

Robison, Sophia M. Juvenile Delinquency: Its Nature and Control. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1960.

Rogers, Dorothy. The Psychology of Adolescence. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962.

Rothstein, Jerome (ed.). Mental Retardation: Readings and Resources. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

Rubin, Sol. "The Legal Character of Juvenile Delinquency," Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Science, No. 261 (January, 1949), p. 2.

Saenger, Gerhart. Factors Influencing the Institutionalization of Mentally Retarded Individuals in New York City. Albany: New York State Interdepartmental Health Resources Board, 1960.

Sarason, Seymour and Gladwin, Thomas. Psychological Problems in Mental Deficiency. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Shorr, Joseph E. "The Development of a Test to Measure the Intensity of Values," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLIV (May, 1953), 266-74.

Short, James F., Jr. and Nye, Ivan F. "Reported Behavior as a Criterion of Deviant Behavior," Social Problems,V (Winter, 1957), 207-13.

Shotwell, Anna M. "A Study of Psychopathic Delinquency," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LI (July, 1946), 57-62.

Shulman, Harry M. "Intelligence and Delinquency," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XLI, No. 6 (March-April, 1951), 763-81.

Smith, B. Othanel, Stanley, William O., and Shores, J. Harlan. Fundamentals of Curriculum Development. Rev. ed. Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y.: World Book Co., 1957.

"Standards for State Residential Institutions for the Mentally Retarded," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXVIII, No. 4 (January, 1964), Monograph Supplement.

Stephens, J. M. Educational Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1951.

Sternlight, Manny. "Establishing an Initial Relationship in Group Psychotherapy with Delinquent Retarded Male Adolescents," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LXIX, No. 1 (July, 1964), 39-41.

Stevens, Harvey A. "Overview," Mental Retardation: A Review of Research. Edited by Harvey A. Stevens and Rick Heber. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp. 1-15.

Strauss, Alfred A. and Lehtinen, Laura E. Psychopathology and Education of the Brain-Injured Child. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1947.

Sutherland, Edwin H. "Is 'White Collar Crime' Crime?" American Sociological Review, X (1945), 132-39.

________. "Mental Deficiency and Crime," Social Attitudes. Edited by Kimball Young. New York: Henry Holt, 1931, pp. 357-75.

________. "White Collar Criminality," American Sociological Review, V (February, 1940), 1-12.

Sykes, Gresham M. and Matza, David. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency," American Sociological Review, XXII (December, 1957), 664-70.

Tappan, Paul W. "Who Is the Criminal," American Sociological Review, XII (February, 1947), 96-102.

Tannenbaum, Frank. "The Professional Criminal," Century, CX (May-October, 1925), 577.

Thompson, George G. Child Psychology. Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1952.

The Training School Bulletin. Published quarterly by the Training School at Vineland, N. J.

Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, 1962. XXXIII Washington: Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1963.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. *Justice.* Report No. 5, 1961. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

Van Vechten, Courtlandt C. "Differential Criminal Case Mortality in Selected Jurisdictions," *American Sociological Review*, VII (December, 1942), 833-39.

Wallerstein, James S. and Wyle, Clement. "Our Law-Abiding Lawbreakers," *Probation* (April, 1947), 107-12.

Wallin, J. E. Wallace. *Education of Mentally Handicapped Children*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.

________. *Mental Deficiency*. Brandon, Vt.: Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1956, p. 1.

Warner, W. Lloyd, Meeker, Marchia, and Eels, Kenneth. *Social Class in America*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Whyte, William F. *Street Corner Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1943.

Williams, Harold M. and Wallin, J. E. Wallace. *Education of the Severely Retarded Child*, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education Bulletin 1959, No. 12. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959.

Williams, Ruth. "Casework with Defective Delinquents," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXI (October, 1956), 413-18.

Windle, Charles. "Prognosis of Mental Subnormals," *American Association of Mental Deficiency*, LXVI, No. 5 (March, 1962), Monograph Supplement.

Witlow, C. M. "Attitudes and Behavior of High-School Students," *American Journal of Sociology*, XL (1934), 489-94.

Wolfgang, Marvin E., Savitz, Leonard, and Johnston, Norman. *The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Young, Kimball. *Sociology: A Study of Society and Culture*. New York: American Book Co., 1942.

Zigler, Edward. "Rigidity in the Feebleminded," *Readings on the Exceptional Child.* Edited by E. Philip Trapp and Philip Himelstein. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1962, pp. 141-62.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Name: David Eugene Lema

Date and Place of Birth: November 14, 1928
Stockton, California

Elementary School: Jefferson Elementary School
Stockton, California
Graduated 1942

High School: Stockton High School
Stockton, California
Graduated 1946

College: Stockton College
Stockton, California
A. A. 1949

San Jose State College
San Jose, California
B. A. 1957

Graduate Work: San Jose State College
San Jose, California
M. A. 1960